DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 030 021 AC 002 994

Participants in the Field Test of Four Adult Basic Education Systems: A Follow-Up Study.

Greenleigh Associates, Inc., New York, N.Y.
Pub Date Jan 68
Note-123p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$6.25
Descriptors-Achievement, *Adult Basic Education, Bibliographies, *Effective Teaching, *Followup Studies, *Illiterate Adults, Instructional Materials, Interagency Cooperation, Job Placement, Participant Characteristics, Program Evaluation, Research, Retention, Testing, Welfare Recipients
Identifiers-Learning in High Gear, Learning to Read and Spell, Mott Basic Language Skills Program, Systems for Success

This followup study of the field test and evaluation of selected adult basic education systems was begun in July 1966 and carried out in California, New Jersey, and New York, where the earlier study had been held. The study focused on the impact which the field test and other education and/or training programs had on the participants in terms of educational gain and retention, social awareness and functioning, and economic improvement. Testing and retesting six and 12 months after the field test provided data on over 1,600 persons. Other data were obtained through in-depth interviews with field test participants and teachers, nonparticipant welfare recipients, and personnel of various agencies. Findings on academic achievement, employment, income, welfare grants, interagency cooperation, and attitudes toward involvement in the programs reinforced the results of the original field test with respect to the need for education and training for the functionally illiterate, and the necessity to upgrade and improve all aspects of adult basic education, including curriculums, teacher training, materials, and supportive services. (The document includes 65 references.) (ly)

ED0 30021

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

PARTICIPANTS IN THE FIELD TEST OF FOUR ADULT BASIC EDUCATION SYSTEMS: A FOLLOW-UP STUDY

January 1968

Greenleigh Associates, Inc.
New York   Chicago   Washington   San Francisco

Printed in the United States of America

AC 002 994

greenleigh associates, inc.
NEW YORK
CHICAGO
SAN FRANCISCO
WASHINGTON
355 LEXINGTON AVENUE · NEW YORK, N.Y. 10017 · (212) 986-8645

January 31, 1968

Mr. John C. Muntone
Director, Education Division
Community Action Program
Office of Economic Opportunity
Washington, D.C. 20506

Dear Mr. Muntone:

We are pleased to submit this final report of the Follow-Up Study of the Field Test and Evaluation of Selected Adult Basic Education Systems. The study was begun with base-line data obtained in the field test in 1965-1966 from the screening of approximately 3,000 potential participants involved in the classes.

This project was conducted under contract with the Office of Economic Opportunity in cooperation with the Office of Education and the Welfare Administration. It was begun in July 1966 and was carried out in the states of California, New Jersey, and New York where the field test earlier had been held. State and local departments of education and social welfare agencies were also involved in providing data for the follow-up study.

The study focused on the impact which the field test and other educational and/or training programs had on the lives of the participants in terms of educational gain and retention, social awareness and functioning, and economic improvement.

The factual data on over 1,600 persons sampled concerning their reading gain and retention scores were arrived at through systematic testing and retesting at six-month and twelve-month intervals following the field test. Other data were obtained through in-depth interviews conducted with former field test participants, two other groups of welfare recipients who were screened for but did not participate in the field test. Interviews also w held with former classroom teachers in the field test, and personnel of education, social service and other community agencies.

The study reinforces the findings of the field test with respect to the universal need of education and training for the functionally illiterate disadvantaged and the necessity to upgrade and improve all aspects of adult basic education, including curricula, teacher training, materials and supportive services. It further illustrates the need for thorough interagency planning and development of programs and adequate funding for long term endeavors.

We are grateful to all those who cooperated in this project on all governmental levels, and especially to the local welfare and educational agencies who were extremely generous in donating staff time and facilities for this study.

We are certain that this report will be extremely useful for all those agencies engaged in adult basic education and in the training of the functionally illiterate, disadvantaged toward economic self-sufficiency and social integration into the mainstream of society. We are convinced that programs toward this end cannot be stopgap measures but rather must encompass carefully planned, continuing, cooperative efforts.

Sincerely yours,

Arthur Greenleigh
Arthur Greenleigh
President

AG/aj

cc: Mr. Derek Nunney
Office of Education

Mr. Charles Lavin
Social and Rehabilitation Services

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We wish to express our gratitude to all those who were involved in planning and conducting this follow-up study.

While it is not possible to extend individual recognition to all who played a role in this project, we have tried to single out those whose time and energy were given to the study effort most intensively. Even so, we have not been able to include everyone.

We wish to recognize 18 former field test teachers who graciously consented to be interviewed. There were also over two hundred welfare caseworkers who cooperated in furnishing vital data on the participants in the study in all three states. Numerous community agency directors and their staffs gave us insight into the scope and sequence of their services to the disadvantaged. All these, although unnamed, were vital to the total effort of the study.

We do wish to single out for special recognition several persons in the Federal agencies who played main roles in the study. Mr. John C. Muntone, Director, Education Division, Community Action Programs, Office of Economic Opportunity, was project manager for OEO. This office was instrumental in organizing joint meetings of the cooperating Federal agencies and assisting in making joint decisions for the study's progress. Dr. Derek Nunney, Office of Education, and Mr. Charles Lavin, Social and Rehabilitation Services, served in liaison capacities for their offices in securing the cooperation of their counterparts in the three states.

Those who played major roles in the planning, operation, or analysis of the study are listed as follows:

Greenleigh Associates, Inc.

Irving A. Naiman, Project Coordinator

Headquarters Staff

Sybil Lefferts, Special Assistant who worked on the final report

Linda Rubenstein, Special Assistant who worked on the final report

Patricia Jordan, Research Associate, who had a major role in the preparation of the statistical analysis and the interpretation of data

Field Staff

Lewis T. Brown, Project Supervisor in California
Hope Dipko, Project Supervisor in New York
Bonnie Logan, Project Supervisor in New York
Harry Van Houten, Project Supervisor in New Jersey

Case Analysts: California

Grace Driver
Beatrice Goff
Cerna Hirsch
Marjorie Holloway
Frances Larson
Joe Martinez (deceased)
Donald Porath
Norman Ross
John Wells

Case Analysts: New Jersey

Sydney Clark
Gene Cusack
Gloria De Blasio
Eula Eaton
Carolyn Jackson
Geoffrey Tupper
Jerome Weinstein
Raquel Zirl

Case Analysts: New York

Virginia Brown
Charlotte Harvey
Haydee McAllister
Terri Tolk
Charles Vivona
Johnnie Wilhoit

Special Consultants

Dr. Jacob Cohen, Professor of Psychology, New York University, who provided overall consultation on statistical analysis

Federal Agency Officials

Charles Lavin, Welfare Administration

Derek Nunney, Office of Education

Ronald Shilen, Office of Economic Opportunity

Andrew Truelson, Welfare Administration

State and Local Agency Officials in California

State Department of Education

Stanley Sworder, Chief, Bureau Adult Education

William J.J. Smith, Consultant in Adult Education

State Department of Social Welfare

Lester Lister, Work Experience and Training Consultant, Northern California Department of Social Welfare

Contra Costa County Education and Welfare Staff

J. Wilson Bilyeu, Director, Vocational and Adult Education

Carroll Boyd, Supervisor, Pleasant Hill and Pittsburg Districts, Department of Social Service

William Bristow, Adult Education, Liberty Union High School District

Donald Crawford, Economic Opportunity Projects Coordinator, Department of Social Service

Lester Haagenson, Principal, Mt. Diablo Evening School

Thalbert M. Honea, Principal, Adult School, Pittsburg Unified School District

Robert Jornlin, Director, Department of Social Service and Staff

Wesley Laubscher, Coordinator, Adult Education Program, Mt. Diablo Unified School District

Floyd I. Marchus, County Superintendent of Schools

Randy Oberlatz, Adult Basic Education Supervisor, Department of Social Service

Constance Rinnie, Social Worker Supervisor, Richmond

Fred Ripp, Social Worker Supervisor, East County, Department of Social Service

James Scott, Adult Education, Liberty Union High School District

Harold Stiles, Principal, Evening High School, Antioch Unified School District

Robert Williams, Coordinator, Adult Education Program, Richmond Unified School District

Other County and Community Agencies in California

Commission on Human Relations, Richmond

Community Services for the Spanish-Speaking, Oakland

Community Services for Spanish-Speaking Citizens, Richmond

Concerted Services Project, Inc., Pittsburg

Contra Costa Office of Economic Opportunity, Martinez

Contra Costa County Department of Education, Martinez

Contra Costa County Regional Occupational Center, Martinez

Council of Community Services, Richmond

Department of Public Works, San Pablo

Neighborhood House Job Upgrading, Richmond

Oakland Skills Center, Oakland

Opportunity Industrialization Center, Inc., Oakland

Vocational Rehabilitation R and D Project, Pittsburg

State and Local Agency Officials in New Jersey

Bureau of Adult Education, State Department of Education

Clyde Weinhold, Director

Rocco Gambacorta, Administrator, Adult Basic Education

Division of Public Welfare, State Department of Institutions and Agencies

Irving J. Engleman, Director

George N. Kambis, Title V Projects Consultant

Nicholas J. Perronni, Supervising Auditor, Title V Projects

John A. Taylor, Coordinator, Title V Projects

Camden County Education and Welfare Staff

Thomas A. Barry, Job Developer, Title V, Project 4

Aaron DeKosky, Coordinator, Adult and Community Programs, Camden City Public Schools

Fred L. Streng, Director, Camden County Welfare Board and Staff

Thomas Tull, Project Manager, Title V, Project 4 and Staff

Passaic County Education and Welfare Staff

Manleo Boverini, Director, Adult Education Programs, Passaic

Joseph Greene, Director, Passaic County Welfare Board and Staff

Louis H. Katz, Assistant Project Manager, Title V, Project 4 and Staff

George J. Koch, Director, Adult Education Programs, Paterson

Robert S. Santo, Job Developer, Title V, Project 4

State and Local Agency Officials in New York

Division of Continuing Education, State Education Department

A.T. Houghton, Chief, Bureau of Basic Continuing Education

Joseph Mangano, Associate in Continuing Education

State Department of Social Welfare

C. Walter Driscoll, Area Director, Onondaga and Oneida Counties

Paul Kearney, Senior Welfare Consultant, Title V

Patrick Kelly, Senior Welfare Representative

Gertrude McLean, Senior Welfare Representative

Kalman Mintz, Director, Bureau of Program Standards

Clarissa Nichol, Senior Welfare Representative

Max Waldgeir, Area Director, Nassau County

Nassau County Education and Welfare Staff

Joseph Barbaro, Commissioner, Nassau County Department of Welfare and Staff

Robert Cody, Director of Adult Education, Hempstead Public Schools

Harold Donahue, Administrative Assistant, Glen Cove Public Schools

Irene M. Dwyer, First Deputy Commissioner, Social Services, Nassau County Department of Welfare

John Hotchkiss, Director of Adult Education, Westbury Public Schools

Mary Korff, Assistant to First Deputy Commissioner, Nassau County Department of Welfare

Benjamin V. Louard, Assistant Project Director, Title V Projects, Nassau County Department of Welfare

Michael Maglio, Director of Adult Education, Long Beach Public Schools

Carl W. Monk, Director of Adult Education, Westbury Public Schools

Melvin Rosen, Director of Adult Education, Glen Cove Public Schools

Clayton Williamson, Director of Adult Education, Freeport Public Schools

Syracuse Education and Welfare Staff

William Jacques, Director of Adult Basic Education

John Lascaris, Commissioner, Onondaga County Department of Welfare and Staff

Rudolph Maida, Director of Public Assistance, Onondaga County

Robert F. Mayer, Director, Title V Projects

Utica Education and Welfare Staff

Bernadette Eichler, Coordinator of Adult Basic Education, Utica Public Schools

Elliot W. Hunt, Administrative Assistant Vocational and Adult Education, Utica Public Schools

Michael J. McGuirl, Commissioner, Oneida County Department of Welfare and Staff

Michael Nasser, Director of Social Service, Utica Department of Public Welfare

Francis Rodio, Federal-State Relations, Utica Public Schools

Jesse Vendetti, Deputy Commissioner, Oneida County Department of Public Welfare

Glattus Wasmund, Project Director, Title V and Economic Opportunity Act, Work Experience and Staff

Other County and Community Agencies

Bureau of On-the-Job Training, Division of Manpower Development

New York State Department of Labor, Hempstead

Economic Opportunity Commission, Nassau County

To all of these we express deepest appreciation.

Hazel S. McCalley, Ph. D.
Project Director and Vice President

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction 1
  - A. Background 1
  - B. A Review of the Field Test 2
  - C. Purposes of the Follow-Up 3
  - D. Rationale and Scope of the Follow-Up 3
  - E. Plan of Project 6
    - 1. Location 7
    - 2. Population 7
    - 3. Criteria for Evaluation 7
    - 4. Study Instruments 9
    - 5. Tests 10
    - 6. Interviewers 10
    - 7. Administration 11

II. Description of Study Procedures and the Sample 12
  - A. The Preliminaries 12
  - B. Staff Preparation and Training 13
  - C. First Interview Period 13
  - D. Second Interview Period 14
  - E. Problems Related to Study Population Interviews 15
  - F. Problems Related to Caseworker Interviews 18
  - G. The Sample 19
    - 1. Attrition Rate for the First Interview Period 20
    - 2. Attrition Rate for the Second Interview Period 22

III. Findings: Economic and Social Impact 24

- A. Economic Impact 24
  - 1. Public Assistance Status 24
  - 2. Employment Status 27
  - 3. How Respondents Obtained Jobs 34
  - 4. Job Description 36
  - 5. Income From Employment 38
  - 6. The Unemployed 40
  - 7. Impact of Education and Work Experience Programs on Participant Income and Welfare Grant Costs 41
- B. Social Impact 45
  - 1. Involvement in Community Activities and Organizations 46
  - 2. Knowledge of Community Activities 48
  - 3. Involvement with Children's School Life 49

IV. Description and Evaluation of State and County Agency Cooperation Following the Field Test 53

- A. State Level 53
- B. County Level 56
- C. Summary 60

V. Findings: Educational and Training Impact 62

- A. Characteristics of the Study Population 62
  - 1. Sex, Ethnicity and Age 62
  - 2. Place of Birth and Residence 63
  - 3. Family Characteristics 65
  - 4. Educational Background 66
- B. Involvement in Educational and/or Training Programs 67
  - 1. Basic Literacy Programs 68
  - 2. Other Types of Educational Programs 69
  - 3. Some Observations About Adult Basic Education by Former Field Test Teachers 70

C. Attitudes Toward Involvement in Programs 72

D. Reading Gains and Retention, All Groups 80

1. Field Test Screening (Initial Level) 80

2. Gray's Oral Mean Reading Scores from First Interview Period 80

3. Mean Reading Scores from Second Interview Period 82

E. Reading Gains and Retention, Participant Group 84

1. Mean Change Scores from the Initial Testing Period Interview Period 1 85

2. Mean Change Scores from the End of the Field Test to the First Interview Period 86

3. Mean Change Scores from the End of the Field Test to Second Interview Period 89

4. Conclusions 91

VI. Some Effects of Participation in the Field Test 93

A. What Happened Regarding Further Education and Training 93

B. Child-Related Problems and Relations with Children 96

C. Continuing Relations with Former Teachers and Classmates 99

VII. Summary of Findings and Recommendations 101

A. Findings 101

Educational 101

Attitudes Toward Involvement in Programs 103

Agency Cooperation in Programs 104

Impacts of Programs and Employment on Welfare Grants 104

B. Recommendations 104

LIST OF TABLES

1. Number of Interviews by State and Group: Interview Period 1 14
2. Number of Interviews by State and Group: Interview Period 2 15
3. Unobtained Interviews by State: Interview Period 1 17
4. Unobtained Interviews by State: Interview Period 2 18
5. Comparison of Universe and Interview Period 1, Ethnicity 21
6. Comparison of Universe and Interview Period 1, Sex 21
7. Comparison of Universe and Interview Period 1, Age 21
8. Comparison of Interview Periods 1 and 2, Ethnicity 22
9. Comparison of Interview Periods 1 and 2, Sex 23
10. Comparison of Interview Periods 1 and 2, Age 23
11. Public Assistance Status, by Group: Interview Period 1 (in percents) 25
12. Public Assistance Status, by Group: Interview Period 2 (in percents) 25
13. Change in Public Assistance Status from Interview Period 1 to Interview Period 2, by Group (in percents) 27
14. Employment Status, by Group: Interview Period 1 (in percents) 28
15. Employment Status, by Group: Interview Period 2 (in percents) 31
16. Change in Employment Status From Interview Period 1 to Interview Period 2, by Group (in percents) 32
17. Involvement in Additional Education and/or Training Programs: Group I, Interview Period 2 by Change in Employment Status From Interview Period 1 to Interview Period 2 (in percents) 34
18. How Respondent Obtained Job, by Group: Interview Period 1 (in percents) 35
19. How Respondent Obtained Job, by Group: Interview Period 2 (in percents) 35
20. Respondent's Full-Time Job, by Group: Interview Period 1 (in percents) 37

21. Respondent's Full-Time Job, by Group: Interview Period 2 (in percents) 37

22. Respondent's Part-Time Job, by Group: Interview Period 1 (in percents) 38

23. Respondent's Part-Time Job, by Group: Interview Period 2 (in percents) 38

24. Respondent's Take-Home Weekly Salary, by Group: Interview Period 1 (in percents) 39

25. Respondent's Take-Home Weekly Salary, by Group: Interview Period 2 (in percents) 39

26. Reasons for not Seeking Employment, by Group: Interview Period 1 (in percents) 41

27. Participation in Community Organizations, by Group: Interview Period 1 (in percents) 48

28. Participation in Community Organizations, by Group: Interview Period 2 (in percents) 48

29. Parent Attendance of PTA, by Group: Interview Period 2 (in percents) 50

30. Respondent Visits to Children's School in the Past Year, by Group: Interview Period 2 (in percents) 50

31. Reasons for Visiting Children's School, by Group: Interview Period 2 (in percents) 51

32. Parents' Aspirations for Children's Educational Attainment, by Group: Interview Period 2 (in percents) 52

33. Parents' Expectations for Children's Educational Attainment, by Group: Interview Period 2 (in percents) 52

34. Sex, Ethnicity, and Age of Respondents, by Group: Interview Period 1 (in percents) 63

35. Place of Birth of Respondents, by Group: Interview Period 1 (in percents) 64

36. Length of Time in Present State, by Group: Interview Period 1 (in percents) 64

37. Marital Status of Respondents, by Group: Interview Period 1 (in percents) 65

38. Number of Children in Household, by Group: Interview Period 1 (in percents) 65

39. Highest Grade Completed, by Group: Interview Period 1 (in percents) 66

40. Status in Basic Literacy Programs, by Group: Interview Period 1 (in percents) 68

41. Status in Basic Literacy Programs, by Group: Interview Period 2 (in percents) 69

42. Number Involved in Other Types of Programs, by Group: Interview Period 1 69

43. Number Involved in Other Types of Programs, by Group: Interview Period 2 70

44. Gains Reported as the Result of the Programs, by Group: Interview Period 1 (in percents) 72

45. Gains Reported as the Result of the Programs, by Group: Interview Period 2 (in percents) 73

46. Reasons for Wanting to Become Involved in Education and/or Training Programs, by Group: Interview Period 1 (in percents) 78

47. Reasons for Not Wanting to Participate in Education and/or Training Programs, by Group: Interview Period 1 (in percents) 79

48. Reasons for Not Wanting to Participate in Education and/or Training Programs, by Group: Interview Period 2 (in percents) 79

49. Mean Reading Scores, Field Test Screening Period (Initial Level), by State and Group 80

50. Mean Reading Scores, Interview Period 1, by State and Group 81

51. Mean Reading Change Scores from Initial Testing Period to Interview Period 1, by State and Group 81

52. Mean Reading Scores, Interview Period 2, by State and Group 82

53. Gray's Oral Mean Change Scores from Initial Testing Period to Interview Period 1 by Reading System and Teacher Level: New Jersey 85

54. Gray's Oral Mean Change Scores from Initial Testing Period to Interview Period 1 by Reading System and Teacher Level: New York 85

55. Gray's Oral Mean Change Scores from Initial Testing Period to Interview Period 1 by Reading System and Teacher Level: California 86

56. Average Gray's Oral Mean Change Scores from Initial Testing Period to Interview Period 1 by Reading System and Teacher Level: Three States Combined 86

57. Gray's Oral Mean Change Scores from End of Field Test to Interview Period 1 by Reading System and Teacher Level: New Jersey 88

58. Gray's Oral Mean Change Scores from End of Field Test to Interview Period 1 by Reading System and Teacher Level: New York 88

59. Gray's Oral Mean Change Scores from End of Field Test to Interview Period 1 by Reading System and Teacher Level: California 88

60. Average Gray's Oral Mean Change Scores from End of Field Test to Interview Period 1 by Reading System and Teacher Level: Three States Combined 89

61. Gray's Oral Mean Change Scores from End of Field Test to Interview Period 2 by Reading System and Teacher Level: New Jersey 90

62. Gray's Oral Mean Change Scores from End of Field Test to Interview Period 2 by Reading System and Teacher Level: New York 90

63. Gray's Oral Mean Change Scores from End of Field Test to Interview Period 2 by Reading System and Teacher Level: California 91

64. Average Mean Change Scores from End of Field Test to Interview Period 2 by Reading System and Teacher Level: Three States Combined 91

65. Assignments Interviewee Was Offered After the Field Test: Interview Period 95

I. INTRODUCTION

This is a report of the follow-up study of the field test of adult basic education systems, conducted from June 1966 to January 1968. Both the field test and the follow-up study were designed and executed by Greenleigh Associates in three states: New Jersey, New York and California. They were conducted under contract OEO 89 for the Office of Economic Opportunity, in cooperation with the Office of Education and the Welfare Administration.

A. Background

The purpose of the field test was to evaluate the effectiveness of four adult basic education systems for functionally illiterate adults with an economically dependent adult population. The purpose of the follow-up was to answer certain questions regarding long-term effects of participation in the field test.

The field test, which served as the impetus for the follow-up study, was conducted from March 1965 to May 1966. It was a cooperative research project involving not only the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Office of Education and the Welfare Administration at the Federal level, but also some 28 State and local education and welfare agencies.

The plight of millions of educationally disadvantaged adults, their inability to function effectively in the economic and social life of an enormously prosperous country, the effects of this dysfunctioning on their families and children have all been documented with chilling accuracy. The need for education and skill upgrading for this functionally illiterate population has been recognized, and efforts to meet these needs have been launched in the inner cities of urban areas and poverty-stricken rural areas by Federal, State and local governmental agencies.

The complexities involved in launching and administering these programs, recruiting the population, providing the proper kinds of teachers, curricula, materials, and testing programs were experienced in microcosm in the field test.

Many ponderable questions were answered concerning the functionally illiterate, economically dependent population who participated: their demographic characteristics, their ability to learn within a specific educational framework, their desire for education, their reaction to specific materials of instruction, their motivation and aspirations for themselves and their children. In a summary statement in the final report, the following conclusions were expressed:

> The results of the Field Test substantiate the feeling among adult educators that a good many learning systems are inadequate, and perhaps there is none that is fully suitable for the semiliterate and illiterate poor. On the other hand, the evidence indicates that there are available systems that can be used with success by teachers without the usual credentials, but with qualities of heart and mind which make them responsive to their students as human beings with potentials that can be developed. And it served to identify many possibilities which could be developed in all fifty states through the cooperative efforts of public agencies, especially education, welfare and health. 1/

Salient observations and conclusions were reported and recommendations made in the report.

But unanswered were the questions concerning the longer range impact of this educational experience on the participants in terms of their educational, economic and social movement.

These questions led to the proposal for a follow-up study of the group six months and a year after their experience. This is the final report of that follow-up.

B. A Review of the Field Test

The participants were a selected group of functionally illiterate welfare recipients who had been screened and found to be reading below the fifth-grade level. Initially in each of the three states, 540 were placed in 36 classes, on a random basis. In accordance with the research design participants had been selected to assure a representation of age, sex and ethnic background. Each class had approximately the same diverse grouping. Replacements for dropouts were also made according to the design, insofar as was feasible.

Four different basic education systems were used in the 36 classes, 9 classes for each system. Teachers were selected with three different levels of preparation: certified teachers preferably with training or experience in adult education, college graduates without teacher training or experience, and high school graduates without teaching experience.

1/ Greenleigh Associates, Inc., Field Test and Evaluation of Selected Adult Education Systems, (New York: 1966), p.3.

The teachers, systems and classes were organized for research purposes in the following manner: each of the four systems had nine teachers, three for each different level of teacher preparation, for a total of 36 classes in each state. A sum of 108 classes, 108 teachers and approximately 1,600 students were involved in the three states.

The teachers were provided preservice training in systems by field representatives of the publishers. Two and one-half hours each morning, for 17 weeks, were devoted to prescribed methods as delineated by the systems taught. The afternoon hours were devoted to unstructured lessons in mathematics and social studies. Field trips complemented the afternoon program. Standardized and specially devised attitude questionnaires were utilized during the period of instruction, including the same pre- and post tests.

The final report of the field test contains the details of the design, a history, descriptions of students, teachers, basic education systems and testing materials.

C. Purposes of the Follow-Up

The purposes of the follow-up study were:

1. To determine the extent to which reading skills were retained and participants continued interest in educational opportunities after the end of the field test and to assess any differences between the status of participants and those reading at the same level who chose alternatives to participation.

2. To evaluate the effects of an educational experience on life style, that is, income, housing, family relations, health and motivation. This evaluation was to include those who read at fifth-grade level or above who received other education or work-training experience.

3. To evaluate the extent to which cooperating welfare and education agencies at the local level continued to plan and work together after the close of the field test on educational and work-training programs for the deprived.

4. To analyze in gross terms the cost-benefits of the field test and any other education and work-training which the participants received.

D. Rationale and Scope of the Follow-Up

While many questions were answered in the field test, some of the significant findings generated interest in a follow-up study. Following is a discussion of the findings in terms of their implications for further study. To a large extent these findings determined the areas of investigation for the follow-up.

> Almost all students showed some gain in reading ability during the field test. However, there was no significant difference in student gain scores by reading systems.[2]

The questions which were addressed in the follow-up were: What happened to reading skills following the field test? Were they retained or improved by further education, or did they diminish? While there was no difference in gain by reading system, is it possible that a particular reading system exercised greater retentive powers than other systems?

> There were no significant differences in gain scores from the first to the final Gray Oral Tests by level of teacher preparation.[3]

The study strove to determine whether there were any differences in the retention of reading gains by level of teacher preparation--whether students taught by certified teachers retained skills for a longer period of time.

> None of the four systems were able to bring the majority of students from the 4.9 grade level or below to the eighth-grade level in seventeen weeks of two and one-half hour daily use. However, all of the systems brought some students to the eighth-grade level.[4]

There are several questions which come to mind when presented with the above finding. One was whether the retention of reading gains was greater, or lesser, for those who made the most accelerated progress than for those who made average progress, and if so, is it attributable to any one system. Another was how much gain was made by participants entering other educational programs and whether such gain was in any way related to the system in which they participated in the field test.

> According to the statements of students in interviews, there was considerable learning beyond classroom subject

---

[2] Ibid., p. 15

[3] Ibid.

[4] Ibid.

> material. They learned that they could learn. They learned new self-esteem, to speak up in a group, and to work and mingle with persons of many different backgrounds. The classes had a positive effect on family relationships, community relationships and ability to travel around the community. 5/

A major area of investigation in the follow-up study is the persistence of the positive effects produced by the field test and the carryover into economic, family and social areas a year removed from the generating influence of the field test.

> It is not possible to obtain data on attitude changes of these students by using a form administered to a group. This can be done only through individual interviews because any responses in a group situation are affected by interaction. This is because functionally illiterate adults have to have the questions read aloud and interpreted, which leads to group discussion. Therefore, responses are group responses--not individual responses. 6/

The interview schedules developed for the follow-up study were addressed to a variety of attitudes and attitudinal change patterns among the study population. The interviews were nondirective, conducted individually. Questions dealing with the field test and educational involvement following the field test were highlighted with a specific focus on attitude and change in attitude toward involvement.

> When more than one agency is involved in cooperative research, coordination does not occur spontaneously. A third party is necessary to bring cooperating agencies together, to maintain communications and to assure that time schedules are kept. 7/

A distinct focus of this study was the continuing cooperation of welfare and education agencies in structuring and conducting programs for disadvantaged functional illiterates. To this end, interviews were held with the appropriate agencies at the state, county and local levels, and programs and reports

---

5/ Ibid., p. 16

6/ Ibid.

7/ Ibid.

have been examined pertinent to agency activities.

> The different Federal funding arrangements make it difficult for states and localities to plan for continuing cooperation....Thus, long-range cooperative plans to carry students through a complete basic education experience cannot be made.[8]

Funding arrangements have been studied in an effort to isolate the problems which make joint agency planning and cooperation difficult. Funding problems are an area which agencies have reported as being a major stumbling block in developing and carrying through long-range education plans.

> If students from the poverty population are to be able to attend classes regularly, back-up services like those given by the welfare departments are essential. Transportation, child care and health problems are continuing problems which most students cannot handle without help.[9]

Interview schedules and caseworker schedules have furnished data concerning back-up services of the welfare agencies for the study population involved in educational and work experience programs. In addition, field supervisors have interviewed welfare agency officials and adult education supervisors in regard to services necessary for optimum regular attendance by poverty population students.

E. Plan of Project

Because of administrative difficulties in getting the field test underway in the three states at the same time, it was concluded at different times in the three states. The New Jersey classes were completed in February 1966, the New York classes in March 1966 and the California ones in May 1966. According to the design of the follow-up study, the study population was to be interviewed at two different intervals, 6 and 12 months, after the conclusion of the field test. Therefore, the initial interviews were begun in New Jersey, New York and California in August, September and November 1966, respectively. The second interviews were conducted 6 months later in each state.

Over 3,000 individual interviews were conducted with the study population. A like number of interviews were held with caseworkers of county welfare departments and Title V project counselors. Eighteen former field test teachers who were still teaching adult basic education classes were also interviewed.

---

[8] Ibid., p. 18.

[9] Ibid.

1. Location

In each of the three states, the counties included in the field test and study were:

New Jersey: Passaic and Camden Counties

New York: Nassau, Onondaga and Utica Counties

California: Contra Costa County

During the follow-up, field offices were established in each of the counties, and contacts with education and welfare were re-established.

2. Population

In order that the effect of the field test on participants might be isolated, two other groups were added to the follow-up study. They were arranged in three distinct groups for the study:

Participants - those who completed the 17 weeks of basic education in the field test.

Nonparticipants - those who were qualified to participate in the field test but who chose other alternatives.

Overqualified - those who scored above the 4.9 reading cutoff grade on the Gray Oral Reading Test used in screening.

The design called for approximately 500 persons in each state to be interviewed twice, at 6- and 12-month intervals following the field test. It was decided to oversample during the first interview session to assure that expected attrition would not interfere with the completion of a minimum of 500. A description of the sample is given in Chapter II. Characteristics (by groups) of the population interviewed appear in Chapter V.

3. Criteria for Evaluation

The criteria used to evaluate the field test were related to the specific social, educational, and economic goals of that project. The follow-up study, using base-line information from the field test, retains the essential field test criteria, but gives them a new and distinct focus. The emphasis is on retention, improvement or diminution of gains in reading skill level and the social, economic and motivational gains achieved in the one-year period following the field test. These criteria and the measures used to evaluate them follow:

Criterion One: To determine whether the level of reading skill reached by the participants at the end of the field test was retained, improved upon or diminished over a period of 12 months following the field test, concomitant with or without further participation in education or work experience programs. Also for those who did not participate in the field test, whether nonparticipants or overqualified, what change has taken place in reading level?

Measures: Change in reading level of each interviewed respondent via Gray Oral Reading Paragraphs Test given at 6- and 12-month intervals correlated with data relative to respondent's participation in further education or work experience programs.

Criterion Two: To assess the extent to which respondents, given the opportunity, could take advantage of job opportunities and/or work experiences.

Measures: Data derived from interviews with respondents and interviews with caseworkers at 6- and 12-month intervals.

Criterion Three: To ascertain the extent to which participants were better able to meet their adult responsibilities with respect to helping children with school work, planning purchases more rationally, participating in community activities, and expressing realistic aspirations.

Measures: Data specifically related to the areas of adult responsibility and social experience, derived from interviews with respondents and with caseworkers at 6- and 12-month intervals.

Criterion Four: To determine whether any of the reading systems and/or levels of teacher used in the field test had more carry-over than others in terms of reading skill retention or improvement.

Measures: Testing of respondents with Gray Oral Reading Paragraphs Test at 6- and 12-month intervals and analysis and comparison of scores by system and teacher level.

Criterion Five: To assess the benefits of the field test and the education and work experience programs in which the respondents participated subsequent to the field test in terms of economic gains, and the actual costs of the programs.

Measures: Cost data of field test and programs from program directors of Title V and adult education supervisors. Welfare grant data from welfare department caseworkers. Analysis of employment data relative to those respondents who were involved in education and work experience programs. Analysis of welfare grant data in terms of effect of programs in reducing or eliminating welfare grants for respondents involved in programs.

Criterion Six: To assess in respondents the degree of educational and social motivation which continued after the field test, relative to such factors as continued association with teachers and classmates, self-perception of individual, current reading habits and social interests.

Measures: Analysis of interview data in special areas pertinent to above criterion, derived from respondent and caseworker interviews, interviewers' perception of respondents, caseworkers' perception of respondents.

4. Study Instruments

a. Interviewee Schedule

The interviewee or respondent schedule to be used with nondirective interview techniques was constructed by a multidisciplinary staff of Greenleigh Associates, field tested for several days, and revised. It was organized to focus on basic research questions; the answers were to be found through the analysis of data accumulated in the following areas:

1) demographic information

2) education and training experience

3) employment and income

4) social experience

Following the first interview, the schedule was revised again for consistency, and data items which were not productive of information were dropped, while others were added.

b. Caseworker Schedule

The caseworker schedules were designed to provide corroboration of particular data in the interviewee schedules through the caseworker's estimate of client change. For New Jersey, where caseworker counselors for the

Title V projects appeared to have a closer ongoing relation with their clients than did the welfare caseworkers, a third schedule was added.

5. Tests

The Gray's Oral Paragraphs Test was one of the simple reading instruments used for the screening operation and during the field test to obtain grade-level data for the participant population. It was selected upon the recommendation of the New York State Education Department and approved by all the agencies involved cooperatively in the field test at both state and Federal levels.

Although its validity for this disadvantaged adult population is as questionable as that of any other standardized reading instrument designed to test school-age children, it was used for the reason of test consistency. The Gray Oral and the Iowa Test of Basic Skills were both utilized during the field test, and it was found that their correlation was highly positive. Since the Iowa Test of Basic Skills was considered operationally unfeasible for this study for a variety of reasons, and since a new instrument could not be introduced because comparative base-line data for the Gray Oral was already in existence, no change was possible and the use of the Gray Oral was continued.

The Gray Oral was given to respondents twice following the two interviews in their homes.

Data on test scores have been used to illustrate gain and retention for the different groups, including the independent variables of state, system and teacher level of preparation, and the dependent variables of sex, ethnicity and age wherever subgroup analysis was statistically feasible. In addition, correlation of reading gain and/or retention with continued education and/or work experience following the field test has been analyzed.

6. Interviewers

In each state five to six interviewers were recruited. Several criteria were used in assessing interviewer expertise and flexibility for the position. An MSW was desired, with experience in relating to a poverty population. One fluent bilingual interviewer was recruited in each state to conduct interviews with the Spanish-speaking populations. The majority of the interviewers were professionally trained social workers; some were certified teachers with guidance backgrounds and others, experienced public welfare workers.

All were given a week of training prior to the interview period in the materials to be used, the purpose of the study, the nondirective method of interviewing, and the administration of the reading test.

7. Administration

The follow-up study was administered completely by Greenleigh Associates, with the cooperation of the Office of Economic Opportunity and the offices of Education and Welfare of HEW. The social welfare and education departments of the three states as well as their local counterparts on the county level were also involved on a cooperative basis.

The project research staff consisted of a project director and an assistant project director who were responsible for the total direction of the project in the three states and for liaison with state departments of welfare and education as well as the Federal agencies concerned. The three states each had a state supervisor responsible for consultations with local welfare, education, and other agencies affected by the research. The supervisor was responsible also for structuring the schedule of interviews, supervising the interviewers, and making certain the research elements were observed and carried through.

A research consultant and a statistical consultant were also assigned to this project. In addition, the total resources of the Greenleigh Associates staff, including experts in the schedule construction, research methods, and data processing have been used at various times during the study.

II. DESCRIPTION OF STUDY PROCEDURES AND THE SAMPLE

A. The Preliminaries

Subsequent to the approval in early June 1966 of a follow-up study of the field test, meetings were held in Washington with officials of the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Welfare Administration, and the Office of Education concerning the scope of the project and the kinds of information these agencies were desirous of obtaining. A research design was developed and field instruments were constructed. These were then sent to Washington for cooperating agency information and comment.

During the months of June and July, preliminary work was done in focusing on the areas of study and refining research questions. Supervisors for the three states were hired, and meetings were held to orient the staff in project administration, utilization of the various instruments, the parameters of the study, the community agencies with whom the project would cooperate, and the selection of interview staff.

In the interim, the Federal agencies informed their state counterparts (OEO, adult education and welfare) of the forthcoming study, requesting they inform their local agencies, as well. As soon as all local-level agencies were apprised of the project, contact was made with designated agency heads and project staff arranged meetings to discuss the nature of the study and their agency's role and involvement in it. These meetings were held several weeks in advance of the activation of the study in the specific states and communities in order to give the agencies time to alert their staffs to the particular cooperative tasks they would be called upon to perform.

In the follow-up study, the major share of the work of the cooperating agencies was to be done by the welfare department and/or the county Title V agency. Their contributions toward the study were in alerting the study population to the impending interview, checking on the accuracy of the last known addresses of those to be interviewed, supplying space and scheduling interviews with caseworkers whose clients were part of the study, and furnishing study supervisory staff with information and documentation of the various educational and work experience projects undertaken following the field test.

The adult education supervisors in each school district of the county were to furnish information on educational projects undertaken, whether jointly with Title V or the welfare department, or alone. Other information to be obtained from them included the specifics of the involvement of the study population, the addresses of former teachers in the field test still involved in adult basic education activities, and an evaluation of the ABE projects evolved since the field test in terms of the cooperation of welfare in such areas as structuring the programs, recruitment, and the funding of back-up services.

In all instances the re-establishment of contact with the local agencies was a relatively simple matter. Hardly six months had elapsed since the end of the field test during which time there had been almost daily interchange and cooperation. With few exceptions, most of the agency personnel were those with whom Greenleigh Associates had had the most cordial working relationships. And, the scope of the field test had added new dimensions in cooperation and innovative thinking in the area of responsibility for assisting functionally illiterate welfare recipients to change their economic status and life style. New excitement and thrust had been added to the jobs of those involved. Problems of course did arise, but in the main their inception was not caused by lack of cooperation.

B. Staff Preparation and Training

Orientation and training of staff required a full week in each state. During this period, the background and history of the field test were explained, and the nature and problems of the study population were discussed. The interview schedule was gone over in minute detail, to clarify the focus of the research and to make explicit the kind of data that was required. Staff received training and practice in the techniques of nondirective interviewing and in administering the Gray Oral Reading Paragraphs Test. Special emphasis was placed on recording errors, scoring, and timing of the tests. Following the initial interviews, staff met to review their experiences. Revisions were made in the interview schedule on the basis of these discussions. Regularly scheduled meetings were held thereafter with interview staff during the two interview periods.

C. First Interview Period

During the first interview period in the three states, the field staff conducted a total of 1,641 interviews with the respondents of the three target groups and a like number of interviews with welfare caseworkers or casework counselors. Initially it had been felt that more interviews could be obtained, but various problems described in the next sections precluded a larger total. Problems in finding the interviewees cut down the productivity of the field staff; they were able to average less than two interviews per day, rather than the anticipated three plus.

The interviews obtained are shown in the table below:

Table 1

Number of Interviews by State and Group: Interview Period 1[a/]

State	Total	Groups I	Groups II	Groups III
Total number	1,641	919	205	517
New Jersey	557	224	90	243
New York	584	364	66	154
California	500	331	49	120

---

a/ Numbers and percentages of "no answer" and "does not apply" categories are excluded from tables unless significant. Percentages may not add to 100 percent and numbers may not equal totals because of exclusion of "no answer," "does not apply" or because of multiple responses to categories which were not mutually exclusive.

D. Second Interview Period

Approximately three months from the close of the interview periods in each state, orientation and training for the second interview were begun. Some staff attrition had occurred in all the states, and replacements had to be found. In two of the states some permanent Greenleigh Associates staff who were professionally trained social workers were used to fill the vacancies.

Two days of intensive training were held to examine the simplified schedule developed for the second interviews, and to review interview techniques and the administration and scoring of the Gray's Oral Reading Paragraphs Test. Staff conferences were held at the midpoint and at the end of the interview period.

Problems of locating those to be interviewed again reduced the number obtained. The greatest amount of difficulty was experienced in New Jersey: 443 interviews were obtained out of the remaining 557 in the sample, representing a loss of 20 percent. In California 50 of the remaining sample were lost, or 10 percent. In New York 532 interviews were conducted, with a loss of 52, or 9 percent.

Table 2

Number of Interviews by State and Group: Interview Period 2

State	Total	Groups		
		I	II	III
Total number	1,425	825	167	433
New Jersey	443	191	69	183
New York	532	335	57	140
California	450	299	41	110

E. Problems Related to Study Population Interviews

On the whole, interviewers were received cordially and had little difficulty in engaging respondents in conversation and drawing them out once it had been established that the interviewer was not a welfare department worker. In some instances respondents remained suspicious of the interviewer's independent credentials and refused to believe that the interviewer was not associated with welfare, or that the information would not be passed on to welfare. But generally frankness prevailed, as indicated by some disclosures that the respondents were working on part-time jobs which they hadn't reported to the welfare department.

Very few respondents were hostile or refused to be interviewed. Only in a small minority did the interviewers run into outright refusals: "I don't have to answer those questions. Just because I'm on welfare doesn't mean that anyone can come in here and take down my personal history." The interviewers reported several of these cases.

Most were eager to talk about their problems, if only to air their grievances. The older respondents, who normally lead rather sequestered lives, were gratified that people were interested in talking to them and were most receptive. The younger ones, especially those with many children, expressed bitterness and hopelessness. This was especially reflected in the second round of interviews. Little or no change had taken place in their lives, and for field test participants who were not further involved, who had hoped that conditions would improve, that work training and further educational opportunities would be available, an intense disappointment was reflected in many statements to the effect that: "I wish they had never started those classes /field test/ because we were buoyed up and now we're all let down. It's worse than before."

In one community where welfare recipients had been subjected to several different surveys, interviewers reported that "people were sick and tired of answering questions supposedly in their own interest, when they could see that nothing was being done for them."

There is a mounting reluctance to talk about community problems when the population is convinced that nothing will be done to correct the obvious abuses which are apparent everywhere. Evidence of this was seen in the increased number of respondents who refused to be interviewed in the second period.

The major difficulty experienced by interviewers during both periods was in locating the study population. The addresses which Greenleigh Associates had received were at great variance with those in the welfare department files. Often, even after rechecking, it was impossible to find the individuals.

It took an average of four to five contacts to produce a single interview. Some people could not be found at home because of their participation in educational or work training activities. Subsequent contacts had to be made in the late afternoon, early evening or on weekends.

It is interesting to note, that of those who could be found, only 14 persons refused to be interviewed during the first interview period. The reasons why the 362 interviews were not effected are shown in Table 3.

Interviewing problems for the second period very closely paralleled those of the first. Addresses, even after verification with local agency personnel, were often inaccurate. Many respondents interviewed during the first period had moved away. In Camden, New Jersey, urban renewal projects had uprooted a large ghetto population, causing a good deal of relocation and making it difficult to track down interviewees from this section.

In California, wide-spread Contra Costa County presented many problems. Eastern Contra Costa was extremely difficult: the area is characteristically rural, and homes are widely dispersed. Respondents had route box numbers or post office boxes instead of listed addresses. Typical of the directions for locating the respondents was the following:

> You go to the big oak tree north of Brentwood, turn right and go about two miles; turn left and you will see a little unpainted house. This is where Mr. and Mrs. X live.

Table 3

Unobtained Interviews by State: Interview Period 1

Reasons for Not Obtaining Interview	Total	State New Jersey	 New York	 California
Total number	362	146	84	132
Moved out of city, county, state or country	88	24	19	45
No address, unable to locate	103	69	29	5
Not at home after repeated contacts	134	42	23	69
Hospitalized	7	3	3	1
Deceased	11	2	5	4
In military service	1	-	-	1
In Merchant Marine	1	-	-	1
In penitentiary	1	-	-	1
Refused to be interviewed	14	6	3	5
Contact not attempted	2	-	2	-

As noted previously, resistance to being interviewed also developed among respondents. Little change had occurred since the initial interview and they could not see why they should be questioned again about their lives and problems when nothing seemed to happen.

The number of contacts needed to produce interviews rose sharply. In New York, alone, 1,552 contacts were needed to produce 532 interviews, a ratio of almost 3:1. But this ratio increased to 5:1 and 6:1 in the last 200 interviews obtained. In California there were instances where 10 contacts or appointments had to be made to finally nail down one interview.

Out of the 1,641 respondents from the first period, 1,425 interviews were obtained. This represented a loss of 216 respondents or 13 percent. Table 4 indicates the reasons why the interviews were not effected.

Table 4

Unobtained Interviews by State: Interview Period 2

Reasons for Not Obtaining Interviews	Total	State		
		New Jersey	New York	California
Total number	216	114	52	50
Moved out of city, county, state or country	38	19	4	15
No address, unable to locate	50	29	13	8
Not at home after repeated contacts	60	39	9	12
Hospitalized	8	3	4	1
Deceased	5	2	2	1
In military service	1	-	-	1
In Merchant Marine	1	-	-	1
In penitentiary	2	-	-	2
Refused to be interviewed	34	22	3	9
Contact not attempted	17	-	17	-

F. Problems Related to Caseworker Interviews

Caseworker schedules were designed to gather corroborative data about change patterns in the life styles of those respondents who had been involved in the field test and in other educational or work experience, and in those who were not involved in either program. Special arrangements had to be made with the welfare departments for interviewing caseworkers. In New Jersey, over 100 caseworkers were involved in these interviews, since the cases had been dispersed to the general casework files following the field test. (During the field test, these cases were assigned to special casework counselors.) A similar number had to be interviewed in California.

In New York State the logistics involved in interviewing the caseworkers and arranging schedules was staggering. Over 160 caseworkers in three counties had to be interviewed. Arrangements for scheduling, finding adequate interview space, and getting case records pulled were very time consuming. One welfare commissioner, although eventually cooperative, was very reluctant to involve his casework staff without some overtime compensation from the

Federal or state welfare department. In view of staff shortages, reorganization, and the heavy casework load, his concern was understandable.

Although most caseworkers in the three states were extremely cooperative, there was a sense of frustration apparent among them because they could not give adequate answers to schedule questions and supply specific data based on observations of and contact with clients. In many instances, caseworkers were completely unfamiliar with their clients, had never seen them, and were obviously unaquainted with the case record. This occurred because turnover among caseworkers was unusually high, and reorganization often caused reshuffling of case loads. Even with the case folders in front of them the caseworkers were unable to extract the data asked for because the folders did not contain records of client involvement in educational or work experience programs. In addition to all the difficulties enumerated there was the massive caseload assigned to caseworkers. Although unofficially, one caseworker claimed she was carrying 186 cases.

In effect, with the exception of questions dealing with the client's welfare status, time on public assistance, and some demographic information, all information related to the caseworker's perception of the client, his life style change, and the impact of educational and work experience programs on his life was extremely sketchy.

In summary, the caseworkers' lack of familiarity with their clients and the inadequacy of the case records made it impossible to obtain some vital data in the areas dealing with client change. Those data which were obtained have questionable validity, and under the circumstances it was decided to dispense with utilizing the information from the caseworker schedules.

G. The Sample

The three distinct groups of adults who were screened for the field test constituted the universe for the follow-up study. They were:

Participants - Those who completed the seventeen weeks of adult basic education in the field test. (Hereafter referred to as Group I)

Nonparticipants - Those who were qualified to participate (reading at or below the 4.9 grade level) but who dropped out in the first two days or declined to attend classes. (Hereafter referred to as Group II)

Overqualified - Those who scored above the 4.9 grade level and were thus overqualified for the field test. (Hereafter referred to as Group III.)

The study design called for comparisons of the nonparticipants and the overqualified with the student group that had participated in the field test; 500 persons from each state were to be interviewed twice, at six-month intervals.

The universe for the follow-up in New Jersey consisted of 1,673, and a sample of 703 was drawn. The universe for New York and California consisted of 668 and 632 respectively. Because these numbers in the latter states were so small, the total universe in New York and California was used. The oversampling was employed to assure that expected attrition would not interfere with the completion of a minimum of 500 interviews in each state.

1. Attrition Rate for the First Interview Period

In New Jersey, New York and California a total of 1,641 were interviewed in the first interview period: 557 in New Jersey, 584 in New York, and 500 in California. They were distributed by group as follows:

... 919 in Group I (participants)
... 205 in Group II (nonparticipants)
... 517 in Group III (overqualified)

The 1,641 interviews obtained in the first interview period represent a completion rate of 82 percent. (The reasons why the interviews were not obtained in both periods are explained in an earlier section of this chapter.) The completion rate raises questions about the extent to which the obtained interviews in the first interview period can be taken as representative of the universe. The comparisons of ethnicity, sex, and age for the universe, and the interviews obtained in the first period are shown in Tables 5-7.

The conclusion to be drawn from the data presented is that the 1,641 interviews obtained in the first interview period are representative of the universe.

Table 5

Comparison of Universe and Interview Period 1, Ethnicity

Ethnicity	Percent in Universe	Percent in Period 1
Total number	(2973)	(1641)
Total percent	100.0	100.0
Negro	72.0	61.0
White	15.0	20.0
Spanish-American	12.0	17.0
Other	1.0	2.0

Table 6

Comparison of Universe and Interview Period 1, Sex

Sex	Percent in Universe	Percent in Period 1
Total number	(2973)	(1641)
Total percent	100.0	100.0
Male	14.0	18.0
Female	86.0	82.0

Table 7

Comparison of Universe and Interview Period 1, Age

Age	Percent in Universe	Percent in Period 1
Total number	(2973)	(1641)
Total percent	100.0	100.0
30 years of age or younger	34.0	27.0
Over 30 years of age	66.0	73.0

2. Attrition Rate for the Second Interview Period

A total of 1,425 persons were interviewed in the second interview period: 443 in New Jersey, 532 in New York, and 450 in California. By group, the distribution was:

... 825 in Group I
... 167 in Group II
... 433 in Group III

The 1,425 interviews represent a completion rate of 87 percent of the 1,641 interviews obtained in the first interview period. The attrition rate from the first to second interview period also raises questions about the extent to which the obtained interviews in the second interview period can be taken as representative of the obtained interviews in the first period. The comparisons of ethnicity, sex and age for the 216 not interviewed in the second interview period and those obtained in the second period are shown in Tables 8-11.

The conclusion to be drawn from the data, on the basis of the Chi Square Test, at the .01 level of confidence, is that there is no difference in ethnicity, sex and age for the 216 persons not interviewed and the 1,425 interviewed during the second period.

Table 8

Comparison of Interview Periods 1 and 2, Ethnicity

Ethnicity	Percent in Period 1 Not Interviewed in Period 2	Percent in Period 2
Total number	(216)	(1425)
Total percent	100.0	100.0
Negro	62.0	61.0
White	25.0	20.0
Spanish-American	12.0	18.0
Other	1.0	1.0

X^2=9.6065
.01 level of confidence

Table 9

Comparison of Interview Periods 1 and 2, Sex

Sex	Percent in Period 1 Not Interviewed in Period 2	Percent in Period 2
Total number	(216)	(1425)
Total percent	100.0	100.0
Male	23.0	18.0
Female	77.0	82.0

X^2=2.701
.01 level of confidence

Table 10

Comparison of Interview Periods 1 and 2, Age

Age	Percent in Period 1 Not Interviewed in Period 2	Percent in Period 2
Total number	(216)	(1425)
Total percent	100.0	100.0
30 years of age or younger	34.0	26.0
Over 30 years of age	66.0	74.0

X^2=6.543
.01 level of confidence

III. FINDINGS: ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL IMPACT

A. Economic Impact

One of the primary objectives of the field test follow-up study was to determine the impact of the field test on the economic status of the participants.

In order to measure this impact, indices such as public assistance and employment status were utilized.

In both interview periods, data were sought on the public assistance and employment status, including job descriptions and job income for the three Groups.

1. Public Assistance Status

Approximately six months following the field test (first interview period) 89 percent of the respondents were receiving public assistance. Of the three Groups, Group II had the smallest percentage on public assistance (80 percent). Although these percentages involve four categories of public assistance, as would be expected, the majority of the respondents in each Group were receiving aid to dependent children (AFDC).

In the second interview period, approximately one year after the field test, 87 percent of the respondents interviewed were receiving public assistance. It is of significance that Group II still had the smallest percentage on public assistance, although the percentage was higher than in the first period. Groups I and III tended to have slightly fewer people on public assistance in the second than in the first period.

The following tables present the various categories of public assistance and the relative percentages of the three groups in these categories from the first interview period to the second.

Table 11

Public Assistance Status, by Group:
Interview Period 1 (in percents)

Public Assistance Status	Total	Groups I	II	III
Total number	(1639)	(919)	(205)	(514)
Total percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Old Age Assistance	-	1.0	-	-
Aid to the Partially and Totally Disabled	5.0	6.0	4.0	5.0
Aid to Families with Dependent Children	75.0	74.0	69.0	78.0
General Assistance	8.0	9.0	7.0	7.0
None	11.0	10.0	20.0	10.0

Table 12

Public Assistance Status, by Group:
Interview Period 2 (in percents)

Public Assistance Status	Total	Groups I	II	III
Total number	(1423)	(825)	(165)	(433)
Total percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Old Age Assistance	1.0	1.0	1.0	-
Aid to the Partially and Totally Disabled	6.0	7.0	5.0	5.0
Aid to Families with Dependent Children	71.0	70.0	67.0	76.0
General Assistance	10.0	11.0	8.0	8.0
None	13.0	12.0	19.0	12.0

When the three Groups are compared separately at both interview periods, with respect to changes in public assistance status, it is found that:

... a small percentage of respondents in the three Groups made a negative change. That is, they were not on public assistance during the first interview period, but moved to dependency at the second interview period. Group I had 2 percent, Group II had 3 percent, and Group III had 2 percent who made this negative change.

... more than one-half of the respondents in each Group who were not on public assistance during the first interview period maintained this status at the time of the second interview period. The data showed 6, 15 and 7 percent for Groups I, II, and III, respectively. It must be remembered that these percentages are based on less than 200 respondents during each interview period who were not on public assistance, compared with more than 1,400-1,600 in the study at each interview period.

... the overwhelming majority in each Group showed no change in status. They were on public assistance for both interview periods: Group I, 86 percent; Group II, 77 percent; and Group III, 86 percent.

... positive change was seen with a small number in each Group. The respondents were on public assistance at the time of the first interview, but off at the second interview. This change amounted to 5 percent for all Groups.

These data indicate that only very slight changes in public assistance status took place between both interview periods. For Group I, change could not be related to field test participation. In examining data on involvement in additional educational and/or training programs following the field test classes, a Chi Square Test of significance was run for each of the three Groups. The Chi Test results indicated that from the first to the second interview period there was no significant difference between involvement in additional education and/or training programs and change in public assistance status at the .01 level of confidence.

Table 13

Change in Public Assistance Status
from Interview Period 1 to Interview Period 2,
by Group (in percents)

Change in Public Assistance Status	Total	Groups I	Groups II	Groups III
Total number	(1401)	(810)	(165)	(426)
Total percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Negative change	83.0	2.0	3.0	2.0
No change, positive	7.0	6.0	15.0	7.0
No change, negative	85.0	86.0	77.0	86.0
Positive change	3.0	5.0	5.0	5.0

2. Employment Status

Significant data on employment will be examined later in this section, and the paucity of employment for this population will be shown. It is important that the employment status of this welfare recipient population be viewed in the light of the problems they experienced in gaining and maintaining employment.

According to the field interviewers in each state during both interview periods, the overwhelming majority of the study population asserted their desire to gain independence from welfare. However, they could not envision how to accomplish this goal. The move into gainful employment required the solution of critical difficulties, in most instances related to problems of adequate child care.

The largest group in the study, representing AFDC mothers, reported that they found it almost impossible to cope with getting children off to school, providing child care for preschool children, and simultaneously reporting to their employment site. If children became ill, they frequently had to miss work and risk being dismissed.

Mrs. A. is one example, but the number is legion!

> Initially, Mrs. A. was happy with her new work because it was a steady job. She works from 3 p.m. to 11 p.m. in a laundry. When Mrs. A. leaves for work, she sends her children to her father's house where they stay until 6:30 p.m. They then return home and serve themselves whatever she has prepared. The children remain alone until 8:30 or 9:00 when a 22-year-old brother comes and stays with them until Mrs. A. returns from work at 11:45 p.m. This arrangement is not completely satisfactory, because the brother often has other things to do and cannot stay all the time. The children spend a good deal of time alone. Sometimes they do not go to the father's house and Mrs. A. must depend on neighbors to check up on the children. Mrs. A. feels anxious about the situation, and worries about what can happen to the children in her absence. She has tried to find a solution, but has been unable to find anyone to help her out during her working hours. At this point, the benefits of the job do not compensate for her concerns for her family.

Another problem reported as a deterrent to employment was poor health. Many could not enter employment because of chronic illness; others, like Mrs. H., try to continue despite their afflictions:

> Mrs. H. continued working at a nursing home after the job training experience there. Her employer is pleased with her work and the patients all like her. After several months, she suffered a heart attack; was absent from work for 10 days; and the doctor recommended that she stop working altogether. (She did not get paid for the 10 days.) She felt better and returned to work because she felt she was needed by the patients. When I interviewed her she had once again just returned to work in spite of another episode of sickness. She had a slight stroke which left her left hand partially affected. She said that she was going to try and continue working. She was afraid that the welfare worker would criticize her if she stopped; would label her 'lazy' as though she wanted to get the 'money for nothing.'

The male population in the study presented a rather devastating picture of the lame, the halt and the mentally ill. Very few could be designated as able-bodied, capable of a day's work at physical labor. The following are typical of the many cases field interviewers reported:

> Mr. T. is a very sick man. His wife had been returned to him from the mental hospital. She was obviously hallucinating the day I was there, but he sounded even more incoherent and exhibited many signs of paranoia. He believes the world is being taken over by the Negroes and that is why he cannot get a job.
>
> Mr. B. is destitute. He sustained a back injury several years ago and is unable to work. He has been to doctors who will operate, but cannot promise any improvement in his condition. His wife has sickle cell anemia and cannot work either.
>
> Mrs. C.'s whole family seems to be suffering from poor health. She says her husband has pancreatitis, was hospitalized, and surgery was recommended. The doctor told him that if they operated he would probably remain paralyzed or possibly die of the operation. Mr. C. decided against the operation, and has been suffering along. Against doctors' orders, he continues to work as a carpenter's assistant because he does not like to beg welfare for money. He is under treatment and takes medication. However, Mrs. C. stated that he is extremely thin and at night he screams with pain.

Those males who were able-bodied presented other problems. A number of those interviewed had police records which prevented them from obtaining even a minimal type of employment. Their experiences of rejection had been such that they had little resolve to try again.

Because there were few jobs in the immediate areas where the respondents lived, transportation involved either an additional expense or a time-distance factor. Whether in Camden or Paterson, New Jersey, in Nassau County, Utica or Syracuse, New York, or in the sprawling county of Contra Costa, California, the distances to jobs and the expenses involved in traveling were a deterrent to seeking and maintaining employment.

Considering the impediments to employment and related problems, it is interesting to note that in the first interview period, examination of the data disclosed that 19 percent of the study population were employed. However, of the 311 employed, 98 or almost one-third were part-time workers. Group II, the nonparticipants, had the largest proportion of employed persons. There were 17 percent employed in Group I, 28 percent in Group II, and 18 percent in Group III. The relatively large proportion of employed persons in Group II raises the question as to why they, more than the other Groups, became employed. Groups I and II were similar with respect to their initial reading scores and other characteristics, with the exception that Group II did not participate in the field test or to any large degree in other types of educational and/or training programs. This may be attributed to two possibilities: (1) that Group I to a significant extent were continued in basic education classes following the field test, and were enrolled in basic education classes during the first interview period; (2) that the nonparticipants, Group II, were pressured to enter basic education or seek employment with the threat of dismissal from welfare for noncompliance. Apparently, Group II persons sought and obtained employment rather than engage in education.

During the second interview period, Group I showed an increase in the percentage employed; 20 percent as compared to 17 percent in interview period 1. Group II dropped from 28 percent in the first interview period to 22 percent in the second, and Group III remained about the same for both interview periods.

It is fairly significant that Group I increased its percentage employed over the two interview periods, indicating the possibility that some Group I persons were moved from programs into employment. The reason for the drop in employment in Group II may be attributed to the easing of welfare pressure to maintain employment, the prevalence of dead-end jobs, the onset of problems in continuing employment, or a combination of all three.

Table 14

Employment Status, by Group:
Interview Period 1 (in percents)

Employment Status	Total	Groups I	Groups II	Groups III
Total number	(1638)	(919)	(204)	(515)
Total percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Employed	19.0	17.0	28.0	18.0
Not employed	81.0	83.0	72.0	82.0

Table 15

Employment Status, by Group:
Interview Period 2 (in percents)

Employment Status	Total	Groups I	Groups II	Groups III
Total number	(1422)	(824)	(167)	(431)
Total percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Employed	20.0	20.0	22.0	19.0
Not employed	80.0	80.0	78.0	81.0

In making further comparisons with respect to the employment status of the three Groups from the first to the second interview period, it was found that:

... a small percentage of the people in Groups I, II and III made a negative change in employment status. They were employed at the time of the first interview, but approximately six months later were no longer employed. The distribution for the three Groups was 6, 9, and 5 percent respectively.

... some 10 percent in Group I, 17 percent in Group II, and 11 percent in Group III were employed at both time periods.

... almost three-fourths of the people in Groups I, II and III (75, 69 and 75 percent respectively) were not employed at either time period.

... some 9 percent in Group I, 4 percent in Group II, and 9 percent in Group III made a positive change. They were not employed at the time of the first interview, but became employed six months later.

Table 16

Change in Employment Status From Interview Period 1 to Interview Period 2, by Group (in percents)

Change in Employment Status	Total	Groups I	II	III
Total number	(1402)	(812)	(167)	(423)
Total percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Negative change	6.0	6.0	9.0	5.0
No change, positive	12.0	10.0	17.0	11.0
No change, negative	74.0	75.0	69.0	75.0
Positive change	8.0	9.0	4.0	9.0

These data indicate that there were no significant differences between Group I and Group III in terms of employment over the period of the two interviews. Yet, Group I showed an increase in the number employed at the second interview period. This may be related to the fact that a significant number of them (526) were involved in training programs at the first interview period and were not available for employment. At the conclusion of their training, some persons in Group I did become employed; thus increasing the percentage of the employed in this Group at the second interview period. It must also be pointed out that at the time of the second interview, Group I had approximately 200 persons still involved in educational and training programs. If what occurred at the second interview period, in terms of increased employment following involvement in training, may be taken as an indication of a trend, there is a strong likelihood that a significant number of those now in training may become employed in the future.

Conversely, the fact that Group II showed a negative change in employment, in that proportionately more individuals in this Group left employment and fewer gained employment at the second interview time, may be indicative of a negative trend for future employment.

A Chi Square Test was used to analyze data on involvement in additional education and/or training with respect to employment for Groups II and III at both interview periods. It was found that there was no significant change in employment status in relation to additional education or training for either Group at the .01 or .05 levels of confidence. That is, those who were involved in additional education and/or training were not found to have a significantly higher proportion of employed persons than those not so involved. Therefore, it may be inferred that there was no significant relationship between involvement in additional education and/or training programs and change in employment status for these two Groups for either interview period.

Looking at Group I specifically at the first interview, the results were the same as for Groups II and III, i.e., no significant change in employment status. But at the second interview period for Group I a significant change showing increase in employment status was found at the .05 and .01 levels of confidence. This implied a rather positive relationship between greater involvement in education and training programs, and consequently increased employment status for Group I.

This positive linkage between additional involvement in training and employment for Group I may be indicative of the long-term impact of increased involvement. At this juncture it is too early to speculate on how far this trend may continue in the future.

The data obtained on the relationship between education and/or training and change in employment status follow:

> ... 87 percent of the 47 persons who made a negative change with respect to their employment status from the first to the second period had not received education and/or training at the time of the second interview.
>
> ... 76 percent of the 74 persons who made a positive change with respect to their employment status had not received education and/or training at the time of the second interview.
>
> ... 72 percent of the 605 persons who were not employed at either time period had not received education and/or training at the time of the second interview.
>
> ... 94 percent of the 86 persons who were employed at both time periods had not received education and/or training at the time of the second interview.

Table 17

Involvement in Additional Education and/or Training Programs: Group I, Interview Period 2 by Change in Employment Status From Interview Period 1 to Interview Period 2 (in percents)

Involvement in Additional Education or Training Program	Total	Change in Employment Status: Negative Change	No Change Positive	No Change Negative	Positive Change
Total number	(812)	(47)	(86)	(605)	(74)
Total percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Receiving training	24.0	13.0	6.0	28.0	24.0
Not receiving training	76.0	87.0	94.0	72.0	76.0

$X^2 = 21.29$

.01 and .05 level of confidence

3. How Respondents Obtained Jobs

It is interesting to note that in the first interview period the majority of the respondents indicated they obtained their jobs through friends and relatives. Some 52 percent of those who obtained jobs indicated "friends and relatives" as a source for obtaining jobs. Approximately three-fourths (62 percent) of Group II located jobs through friends and relatives, 51 percent in Group I, and 45 percent in Group III.

Further examination reveals that only 6 percent of Group I obtained jobs after the field test through placement by welfare Title V workers and 16 percent obtained jobs through similar placement after job training programs. Groups II and III had little or no contact with welfare Title V workers for job placement, but utilized such sources as newspapers, public employment agencies, community agencies or special antipoverty agencies as a means of obtaining jobs.

Table 18

How Respondent Obtained Job, by Group: Interview Period 1 (in percents)

How Job Was Obtained	Total	Groups I	II	III
Total number	(279)	(139)	(53)	(87)
Total percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Public employment agency	11.0	9.0	17.0	12.0
Private employment agency	1.0	1.0	2.0	2.0
Newspapers/canvassing	11.0	8.0	12.0	17.0
Friends and relatives	52.0	51.0	62.0	45.0
Placed after field test by DPW staff	3.0	6.0	-	-
Placed after job training by DPW staff	10.0	16.0	4.0	3.0
Other community agency	5.0	5.0	1.0	7.0
Other special antipoverty agency	6.0	4.0	1.0	11.0

Table 19

How Respondent Obtained Job, by Group: Interview Period 2 (in percents)

How Job Was Obtained	Total	Groups I	II	III
Total number	(265)	(158)	(31)	(76)
Total percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Public employment agency	8.0	8.0	9.0	7.0
Private employment agency	1.0	1.0	3.0	1.0
Newspapers/canvassing	22.0	20.0	29.0	22.0
Friends/relatives	36.0	35.0	39.0	36.0
Placed after field test by DPW worker	3.0	4.0	3.0	-
Placed after job training by DPW worker	9.0	14.0	-	7.0
Other community agencies	9.0	9.0	-	12.0
Other special antipoverty agency	4.0	3.0	-	6.0
Other	8.0	6.0	16.0	9.0

4. Job Description

a. Employed Full Time

Of those 311 who indicated they were employed at the first interview period, 296 gave job description information. Some 198 were full-time workers. It is not surprising to note that the majority of the respondents who were employed full time in the first interview period were classified as laborers, operatives, service or household workers. Of the three Groups, Group II had the largest proportion of those who were classified as laborers or operatives. Some Group III people had jobs in two categories which ranked higher on the occupational ladder: some 6 percent had jobs which were classified as professional, technical or managerial, and 19 percent had clerical or sales jobs. Aside from these two job categories in which Group III had more persons employed than did the other two Groups, there were no significant differences among the levels of jobs held by the three Groups. As a corollary, it is important to indicate that despite the fact that a significant difference does exist in regard to educational level between Group I (participants) and Group III (overqualified), this difference did not have a qualitative effect on the kinds of jobs they obtained.

Specifically, this connotes that Group I was able to compete successfully with Group III in the job market. It is difficult to ascertain whether this resulted from an increase in motivation, agency pressure, heightened awareness of job opportunities, favored treatment and counseling by agency, or a combination of any of these factors.

A caveat must be presented in exploring the data. It should be remembered that the overwhelming percentage of jobs were low level, unskilled types, which did not require educational skills of any significance. Therefore, Group I did not have to compete on the basis of educational level with Group III for these jobs.

The distribution of types of jobs held by the full-time workers during the second interview period did not significantly differ from that described for the first interview period.

Table 20

Respondent's Full-Time Job, by Group: Interview Period 1 (in percents)

Respondent's Full-Time Job	Total	Groups I	Groups II	Groups III
Total number	(198)	(98)	(38)	(62)
Total percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Professional/technical/ managerial	4.0	3.0	-	6.0
Crafts/foremen	6.0	5.0	5.0	6.0
Clerical/sales	9.0	4.0	3.0	19.0
Laborer/operatives	41.0	38.0	66.0	31.0
Service/household workers	41.0	50.0	26.0	37.0

Table 21

Respondent's Full-Time Job, by Group: Interview Period 2 (in percents)

Respondent's Full-Time Job	Total	Groups I	Groups II	Groups III
Total number	(185)	(124)	(15)	(46)
Total percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Professional/technical/ managerial	3.0	3.0	6.0	2.0
Crafts/foremen	5.0	6.0	-	4.0
Clerical/sales	3.0	1.0	-	11.0
Laborer/ operatives	30.0	29.0	53.0	24.0
Service/household workers	55.0	56.0	40.0	57.0
Other	3.0	4.0	-	2.0

b. Employed Part Time

In examining data on the types of jobs held by part-time workers from both interview periods, we find that Group I had more persons working part time than did Groups II or III. More than three-fourths of all part-time workers were employed as service or household workers. There were small differences with regard to Group.

Table 22

Respondent's Part-Time Job, by Group: Interview Period 1 (in percents)

Respondent's Part-Time Job	Total Number	Groups		
		I	II	III
Total number	(98)	(55)	(17)	(26)
Total percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Professional/technical/managerial	3.0	2.0	-	8.0
Crafts/foremen	6.0	7.0	6.0	4.0
Clerical/sales	5.0	9.0	-	-
Laborers/operatives	19.0	27.0	12.0	8.0
Service/household workers	66.0	55.0	82.0	81.0

Table 23

Respondent's Part-Time Job, by Group: Interview Period 2 (in percents)

Respondent's Part-Time Job	Total Number	Groups		
		I	II	III
Total number	(79)	(42)	(9)	(28)
Total percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Professional/technical/managerial	4.0	2.0	-	1.0
Crafts/foremen	10.0	7.0	-	18.0
Clerical/sales	3.0	2.0	-	4.0
Laborers/operatives	9.0	14.0	-	4.0
Service/household workers	68.0	69.0	9.0	57.0
Other	6.0	5.0	-	11.0

5. Income From Employment

The majority of the respondents in both interview periods were receiving a weekly net salary of less than $60.00. It will be remembered that the average household size for the study population was 3.5 and if the majority of the employed persons were receiving less than $60.00 per week, and had to live on this wage, we can assume that they would be subsisting below the poverty index of $3,200 a year for a family of four. Even though Group III people tended to have jobs which ranked high on the occupational scale, there was very little difference among the three Groups with regard to weekly net salaries

Table 24

Respondent's Take-Home Weekly Salary, by Group: Interview Period 1 (in percents)

Take-Home Weekly Salary	Total Number	Groups I	Groups II	Groups III
Total number	(292)	(148)	(55)	(89)
Total percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
$39.00 or less	27.0	28.0	33.0	22.0
40.00-49.99	18.0	20.0	9.0	20.0
50.00-59.99	16.0	19.0	15.0	13.0
60.00-69.99	12.0	10.0	13.0	15.0
70.00-79.99	10.0	7.0	9.0	13.0
80.00-89.99	5.0	5.0	9.0	4.0
90.00-99.99	3.0	3.0	-	6.0
100.00-109.99	2.0	1.0	4.0	2.0
110.00-119.99	1.0	1.0	-	2.0
120.00-129.99	1.0	1.0	2.0	-
130.00 and above	4.0	5.0	7.0	1.0

Table 25

Respondent's Take-Home Weekly Salary, by Group: Interview Period 2 (in percents)

Take-Home Weekly Salary	Total	Groups I	Groups II	Groups III
Total number	(275)	(156)	(35)	(84)
Total percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
$ 39.00 or less	36.0	35.0	23.0	43.0
$ 40.00-$ 49.99	12.0	14.0	11.0	10.0
$ 50.00-$ 59.99	13.0	13.0	6.0	15.0
$ 60.00-$ 69.99	12.0	10.0	26.0	11.0
$ 70.00-$ 79.99	10.0	10.0	11.0	10.0
$ 80.00-$ 89.99	5.0	6.0	6.0	4.0
$ 90.00-$ 99.99	4.0	5.0	3.0	5.0
$100.00-$109.99	2.0	1.0	9.0	1.0
$110.00-$119.99	1.0	1.0	3.0	1.0
$120.00-$129.99	1.0	1.0	3.0	1.0
$130.00 and above	2.0	4.0	-	-

6. The Unemployed

The largest number of respondents in the study population indicated that they could not work because they were needed at home to provide the necessary child care for their families. In addition, they did not possess marketable skills to enable them to provide adequate incomes which would offset the expenses of going to work. Little incentive was offered them for going to work since their welfare budgets would be cut as a consequence of their being employed. They felt that taking a job would not be justified when they weighed the effort and attendant problems that this would create against the little they would be able to earn beyond their AFDC allotment.

Characteristic of the many cases reported in this category by field interviewers was Mrs. D.:

> Participant says she enrolled in the field test for educational purposes only. She wanted to better her education in order to help her children, but she did not want to work.
>
> Participant said that it isn't worthwhile for her to take a job for $60.00 a week because welfare would only have to pay the difference to bring her income up to the $286.00 a month she is receiving now. The expenses of child care for her four children and the added expenses of transportation and other items would leave her very little take-home pay. She doesn't feel it makes sense to go to work under these circumstances.

Of the 1,326 persons who were not employed in the first interview period, 76 percent were not seeking employment. Ninety-two percent of those not working in Group II fell into this category (the largest percentage among the three Groups), 73 percent in Group I and 75 percent in Group III.

In examining the reasons for not seeking employment in the first interview period, it was found that 55 percent of the responses indicated that employment was not being sought because respondents were either "needed in the home" or were "too ill or disabled." There were small differences among the three Groups not seeking employment in regard to the types of impediments that prevented them from doing so. The large number of responses (31 percent) indicating that respondents were "needed at home" further substantiates the necessity of expanding supportive services in order for this population to seek employment.

Table 26

Reasons for not Seeking Employment, by Group: Interview Period 1 (in percents)

Reasons for not Seeking Employment	Total	Groups I	Groups II	Groups III
Total number	(1446)	(765)	(212)	(469)
Total percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Needed at home	31.0	27.0	37.0	34.0
Illness	24.0	27.0	27.0	19.0
Lack of skills	21.0	22.0	20.0	21.0
Not interested	24.0	27.0	27.0	19.0
Other[a]	17.0	18.0	8.0	19.0

[a] This category constituted reasons which ranged from: currently engaged in skill training, pregnancy, and lacks English.

7. Impact of Education and Work Experience Programs on Participant Income and Welfare Grant Costs

Following the field test a significant number of the participants were involved in further education and/or work experience programs. Some of the participants went on directly to obtain employment while others became employed after further education or work experience.

Although no attempt has been made to establish a direct causal relationship between educational and/or work experience and employment, the fact remains that prior to the field test, the participants, for whatever reason, were not employed, while following the field test some of them did enter employment. Whether further education, training or renewed confidence in themselves were the motivating factors in their obtaining employment is difficult to ascertain. Some of these considerations are discussed in Chapter V. Findings: Educational and Training Impact.

For the purpose of this analysis, it is assumed that the field test and other programs had considerable positive impact on participant employment.

The data on employment for the participant group indicated that at interview period 1 there were 159 persons employed full or part time. By interview period 2, six months later, only 85 of these were still known to be employed. But at interview period 2 only 106 or two-thirds of the 159 were available for interview. Therefore, the 85 who were still employed represented an employment rate of 80 percent of the 106 who were available for interview at interview period 2.

The other one-third, or 53 of the original 159 employed persons, could not be located or traced, and although it is likely that many of them were employed, no data were available on them. Therefore, they are not included in this analysis. Realistically, however, the fact that they could not be found for interview probably indicates that they were more likely to be employed than not employed.

Further, for the 85 employed at both interview periods, it can be assumed that since they had been employed for six months or longer, some stability had been achieved and that they would continue in employment for a year or perhaps longer.

In addition, at interview period 2 another 77 participants were found to be employed who had not been employed at the first interview period. Assuming that these 77 follow the same pattern as the 159 employed at interview period 1, one-third of the 77 or 26 would not be available if another interview were to be held six months later. This leaves a total of 51 who would be available. Continuing this rationale, it can be assumed that 80 percent of the 51, or 41 persons, would still be employed at this later period and possibly for a year or longer.

Therefore, the total population for which stable employment for a period of at least a year is being assumed are the 85 employed at both interview periods and 41 of the 77 newly employed at interview period 2 or a total of 126. This is a conservative estimate.

In order to ascertain what financial benefits occurred as a result of the field test and subsequent educational and work experience programs, three pertinent data areas must be examined: welfare grant data for this number of employed for three distinct periods, their average income at the two interview periods, and the costs of the field test and other programs for these participants.

a. Welfare Grant Data

Welfare grant data for the 126 participants taken at three distinct periods, indicate a general decline in grants paid per month:

... grant at beginning of field test	$22,050
... grant at Interview Period 1	17,010
... grant at Interview Period 2	12,978

At the first interview period 30 participants were off the welfare rolls completely, receiving no grant; at the second interview period 39 were in this category. Of these, 28 received no welfare grants in either interview period.

Grant payments ranged from $10.00 to $446 per month. It is interesting to note that for the 126 participants, at interview period 1 the total monthly grant was reduced by $5,040; by interview period 2 the monthly grant had been reduced by $9,072.

Projecting this latter reduction for a 12-month period, we find that a sum of $108,864 could, in effect, be saved in welfare grant funds.

For the individual participant whose average monthly grant had been approximately $175 at the beginning of the field test, this figure was reduced to $135 at interview period 1 and to $103 by interview period 2. Using the average grant saving of $72 per month per participant at interview period 2 and projecting it for a 12-month period, it could result in an average grant saving of $864 per participant per year.

b. Participant Income

Income data for this particular universe are available for both interview periods. At interview period 1 the earned monthly income for the 85 participants employed at both interview periods amounted to $19,635 per month, or an average of $231 per participant. At interview period 2 their monthly income was $20,655, or approximately $243 per individual. Adding the income of $9,717 for these 41 newly employed at interview period 2, the total monthly income at interview period 2 for the 126 participants was $30,372 or an average of $241 per participant.

The interview period 2 income projected for 12 months totals $364,464 or an average of $2,893 per person.

It should be kept in mind that income includes both part- and full-time earnings. The range of income for these participants was from $10 to $700 per month. There are also variations in salaries caused by the seasonal nature of some employment. Work attendance is another dependent variable. This could fluctuate, in view of the large number of females in the group, according to child illness and the availability of child-care facilities.

c. Educational and Work Experience Program Costs

Two major sources of funds for the field test were Title IIB for education and Title V for supportive services.

It was difficult to ascertain average costs of education and supportive services because they varied from state to state and county to county. Per capita costs for participants under Title V depended upon such variables as size of family, transportation distance from school attended, and medical rehabilitation. Costs for education varied greatly for such items as rent for classroom sites (from $0 to $1,000), costs of materials, salaries of teachers and aides. The range of Title V costs for all the communities in the field test were from a low of $75 to a high of $125 per month. Similarly, for education costs the communities presented a wide range from $37 to $75 per month. After careful examination of all cost data, consistent averages were established for all Title V and IIB costs.

Costs amounted to an average of $50 per participant per month for education and $95 per month for stipends and other supportive services for a total of $145 per participant per month for the five months of the field test. Therefore, the field test cost for the 126 participants under consideration was $91,350.

After the field test, some 53 participants were involved in further ABE or GED full time for a period of five months and approximately 55 were placed in work-training situations for an average of four months. A few had some ancillary costs for a short period of time at MDTA and skills centers. The costs for these participants amounted to approximately $62,325. The total costs for the field test and educational and work experiences following the field test were $153,675.

d. Summary

From the preceding data it can be ascertained that the expenditure of $153,675 may have produced a projected welfare grant saving of $108,864 per year for this group of 126 participants.

No projection has been made for approximately 200 participants who were still in education or training at the time of the second interview. If these follow a pattern of those in Group I who were previously involved in training programs, a significant number of them should enter employment at the conclusion of their training. This would add an additional welfare grant saving to the $108,864 already credited to the group of 126 in this analysis.

It is not known with any certainty whether this group will continue to be employed for a year or beyond that. The data available are based on a six-month period of employment.

One important caveat must be emphasized. The overwhelming majority (over 90 percent) of those employed are women with children. For this group to remain in continuous employment, supportive services, especially child care facilities, must be available. If these are unavailable or exist as makeshifts, the possibility of keeping these women steadily employed is drastically reduced.

Should all of the 126 participants in this analysis remain employed for two years or more, the costs for education and work experience will have been easily erased in terms of the savings made in welfare grants. In one year from the time of the beginning of the field test, welfare grants had been reduced by 23 percent. In 18 months the reductions amounted to 41 percent.

It also must be borne in mind that the longer this group remains in employment, the higher their income will be; this will further effect welfare grant reduction.

No attempt has been made to analyze other possible cost benefits and savings such as taxes accruing to a community from participants' increased income, benefits to local business resulting from increased consumer purchasing, reduction of staff and overhead for the county welfare departments, etc. This has not been undertaken because of the high risk employment category this population is assigned to, based on the rather unstable nature of many of the jobs they hold, and the unknown employment perseverance of this population.

It should be emphasized that this analysis was based only on an assumption that there was a direct causal relationship between the involvement of these participants in the field test and other educational and/or training programs, and their employment. In reality, the body of data in the report does not bear this out. It merely points to a significant correlation between involvement in other education and training experiences, and employment for the participant group during interview period 2.

B. Social Impact

As has been stated earlier, the study population was primarily comprised of individuals who were welfare recipients. Their knowledge and perception of the function of the institutions which support them or work to better their lives, and of the services obtainable through these institutions, is indispensable for their well-being. Their increased awareness of these institutions and services is a necessity for improving their economic and social status. Consequently, in focusing on the impact which the field test and other education or training had on the social functioning of the study population, their involvement in, awareness of, and perception of community activities and organizations have been considered.

Due to the limitations of the study design, it was difficult to establish a direct relationship between social functioning and participation in the field test classes. In order to establish this relationship, one would have had to have a design which lent itself to studying the three Groups over a more extended period of time, and which attempted to account for intervening variables which might have been causative factors of a relationship between social functioning and program involvement. Working within the limitations of the study design, only one alternative was possible: to describe the social functioning of each of the three Groups and interject assumptions about what differences may have existed among them with respect to social functioning.

1. Involvement in Community Activities and Organizations

In comparing data on involvement in community organizations for both interview periods, it was found that in the first interview period only 12 percent of the total population indicated involvement in community organizations. During the second interview period a total of 31 percent were involved, showing a gain of 19 percent from the first to the second interview period. At the first interview period 17 percent from Group I were involved; 11 percent in Group III were involved, and 7 percent in Group II. For the second interview period, Groups I and III reported the largest percentages of involvement, 32 and 31 percent respectively. In Group II, 22 percent indicated that they were involved in community organizations.

This significant increase in involvement by all Groups and the differences among them with regard to degree of participation in community organizations, including church, antipoverty, fraternal and political, may be attributed to several possibilities:

... involvement in programs where information regarding community organizations was disseminated

... growth of community activities programs in several areas

... casework counselor supplying information and making referrals to various organizations for services

It must be noted that gain in participation differed among the states, and tended to occur in those communities where community action organizations were offering services and establishing rapport with the community at large.

According to the field interviewers, the Spanish-Americans and Mexican-Americans were generally isolated from the mainstream of the poverty population because of cultural differences, prejudice and language difficulties. With the exception of those in the overqualified group, the majority spoke little or no English. They lived in enclaves within the urban or suburban ghettos or rural areas.

The participant group as a whole seemed to be more aware of what was available in terms of training programs and educational opportunities. This may be ascribed to the fact that their interests had been stimulated because they had been involved in a program, and further, that their contacts via teachers and counselors had led to inquiries productive of information which the other two groups were not aware of. They also spoke more of the necessity of education for their children and the need to help them stay in school. On the whole, following the field test, they seemed to be more interested in talking about their experiences and to be more inquisitive about opportunities affecting further education and training.

Nonparticipants, according to the consensus of interviewers, appeared to be more problem ridden, more afflicted with illnesses, more sluggish and unresponsive as a general group. This was the group which had chosen not to participate in the field test. They were apologetic about not having been involved, stating that they had too many health and family problems to contend with.

The overqualified group were viewed as being more alert and brighter than the other two. They expressed hostility at not being selected for the field test. When it was explained that they had scored too high to be programmed, they remonstrated that at least they should have been told. A large number of them in all the states felt that they had been neglected. "Why haven't programs been evolved for us?" "Why only the illiterates?" Despite this attitude, few of them seemed to be aware of any other programs in the community for which they might be eligible.

Despite these generalized impressions gathered by the field interviewers in the three states, there was nothing in the data concerned with knowledge and perception of community activities and organizations which bore out any significant difference among the three Groups. The only areas in which significant differences were indicated were involvement in activities and organizations, and awareness of community activities. Here Group II showed the least involvement of all the Groups.

Table 27

Participation in Community Organizations, by Group
Interview Period 1 (in percents)

Participation in Community Organizations	Total	Groups I	II	III
Total number	(1516)	(916)	(204)	(396)
Total percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Yes	12.0	11.0	7.0	17.0
No	88.0	89.0	93.0	83.0

Table 28

Participation in Community Organizations, by Group:
Interview Period 2 (in percents)

Participation in Community Organizations	Total	Groups I	II	III
Total number	(1417)	(820)	(165)	(432)
Total percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Yes	31.0	32.0	22.0	31.0
No	69.0	68.0	78.0	69.0

2. Knowledge of Community Activities

Of the 1,425 respondents at the second interview period, one-half said that they had never heard of any activities in the community which were designed to better the lives of the people. This was particularly true for residents of New Jersey. In that state roughly 75 percent of the respondents in each of the Groups said they knew of no such activities. In New York 63 percent of the participant Group and 79 percent of the overqualified Group were aware of community activities. There were, however, 60 percent of the nonparticipant Group who had not heard of any community betterment activities. In California slightly over 50 percent in all three Groups had knowledge of such activities; however, again the nonparticipant Group had a higher percentage of those who did not know of such activities.

Of the 694 who knew of community activities to better the lives of the people, almost 70 percent knew of the community action-antipoverty programs. The next most frequently mentioned activities were recreational and community center-type activities. There were 19 percent of the 694 respondents who knew of such activities. Less than 10 percent mentioned civil rights, educational, and church activities.

In terms of what the community agencies were doing or had been doing to better the lives of the people, over one-third of these 694 respondents mentioned job placement and training, and approximately 25 percent mentioned activities for improving housing and the neighborhood, recreation and financial assistance; about 20 percent mentioned tutoring and guidance. There were few mentions of legal aid, voter registration or other activities. Group II persons were less likely to know about specific activities than were those in either Group I or III. Respondents in New York were more aware of specific activities than were those in California, and New Jersey respondents were the least aware.

There were 819 respondents who had ideas about what community activities should be undertaken. Of these, over one-third felt that recreation for children was the most important. Almost 25 percent felt that better housing and neighborhood betterment each were important, and 15 percent felt that the improvement of job opportunities should be an activity in the community. Some 5 percent were interested in child care, school improvement, health facilities and recreation for adults.

3. Involvement with Children's School Life

For specific social and economic reasons, welfare recipients on the whole are not as involved in their children's school life as are middle class parents. Their own failures at school, their rejection by the community, their feelings of inadequacy, all deter them from active involvement in school affairs. It is highly probable that their children have not been primed and motivated to accept the values of education. It is also highly probable that this study population lives in areas where the schools are not of a high quality. Nevertheless, if education is to play a major role in moving this population from their present status, they will of necessity have to become more involved in school-related matters.

It was hoped that the study population's, and especially the participant groups' involvement in education would result in a greater degree of participation in their children's school life.

In examining data from the second interview period on whether or not a parent attended PTA meetings, it was found that more than three-fourths of those responding did not. When the data pertaining to whether or not a parent had visited the schools were examined, a reverse pattern was found. Seventy percent of total population responded positively. The question arises as to what constitutes greater involvement: visiting the schools or attending PTA meetings?

Table 29

Parent Attendance of PTA, by Group: Interview Period 2 (in percents)

Parent Attendance of PTA	Total	Groups I	Groups II	Groups III
Total number	(1105)	(621)	(128)	(356)
Total percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Yes	32.0	30.0	30.0	37.0
No	68.0	70.0	70.0	63.0

Table 30

Respondent Visits to Children's School in the Past Year, by Group Interview Period 2 (in percents)

Respondent Visits to Children's School	Total	Groups I	Groups II	Groups III
Total number	(1099)	(618)	(125)	(356)
Total percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Yes	70.0	70.0	60.0	74.0
No	30.0	30.0	40.0	26.0

For those individuals who visited the schools, there were some 1,120 responses related to reasons for these visits. Seventeen percent of the responses referred to attending PTA meetings, 20 percent to open house or open school week, and 17 percent to student-teacher relationship problems as reasons for visiting schools.

Table 31

Reasons for Visiting Children's School, by Group: Interview Period 2 (in percents)

Reasons for Visiting Children's School	Total	Groups I	II	III
Total number of responses	(1120)	(636)	(96)	(388)
Total percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
To attend PTA meeting	17.0	16.0	20.0	17.0
Open house, open school week	20.0	22.0	21.0	18.0
Other formal type activity	6.0	5.0	2.0	8.0
Teacher problem/student-teacher relationship	17.0	17.0	11.0	18.0
Academic problems	8.0	9.0	7.0	7.0
Educational guidance	2.0	1.0	-	3.0
To find out how children are doing in school	6.0	6.0	7.0	5.0
Requested to visit school, reason unspecified	1.0	1.0	1.0	-
To talk to teacher, reason unspecified	21.0	20.0	27.0	20.0
Other reasons	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0

In terms of level of parents' aspirations for educational achievement for their children, the data from the second interview period indicated that 47 percent of respondents with children between 13-18 years of age aspired for their children to graduate from high school, and some 39 percent aspired for their children to graduate from college. When the data were analyzed with respect to how far the parents really expected their children to go in school, it was found that 53 percent of the respondents expected their children to graduate from high school, and 25 percent expected them to graduate from college.

It is also significant that 11 percent did not have expectations regarding educational achievement, but thought that it was "up to the child."

There were no significant differences among the three Groups as to levels of aspiration and expectation in regard to their children's schooling.

Table 32

Parents' Aspirations for Children's Educational Attainment, by Group: Interview Period 2 (in percents)

Parents' Aspirations		Groups		
Re: School	Total		II	III
Total number	(712)	(423)	(77)	(212)
Total percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Eighth grade	1.0	1.0	3.0	-
Graduate from high school	47.0	43.0	44.0	48.0
1-2 years of college	6.0	6.0	8.0	7.0
Graduate from college	39.0	40.0	39.0	37.0
Graduate from vocational training	4.0	4.0	3.0	6.0
Has not thought about it	1.0	1.0	-	-
Up to the child	3.0	4.0	3.0	1.0
Other	2.0	1.0	3.0	2.0

Table 33

Parents' Expectations for Children's Educational Attainment, by Group: Interview Period 2 (in percents)

Parents' Expectations		Groups		
Re: School	Total	I	II	III
Total number	(676)	(397)	(75)	(204)
Total percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Eighth grade	1.0	1.0	3.0	-
Graduate from high school	53.0	54.0	52.0	52.0
1-2 years of college	6.0	7.0	3.0	7.0
Graduate from college	25.0	25.0	23.0	25.0
Graduate from vocational training	3.0	2.0	5.0	5.0
Has not thought about it	1.0	1.0	-	-
Up to child	11.0	10.0	15.0	10.0

IV. DESCRIPTION AND EVALUATION OF STATE AND COUNTY AGENCY COOPERATION FOLLOWING THE FIELD TEST

There was a wide range of responsibilities among the 31 Federal, state, and local agencies which were cooperatively involved in the field test. The mounting of the research effort involved the selection of communities in three states, materials, and teachers, the recruitment and selection of students, medical screening, the provision of supportive services for the students, and the administration of 17 weeks of classes, with the accompanying attendance activities and testing.

Greenleigh Associates had primary responsibility for assuring that the research design was carried out, that the data were gathered, and that reports were prepared. An unanticipated role in which Greenleigh Associates found itself acting was that of program coordinator: maintaining communications between agencies and bringing cooperating agencies at the state and county levels together. The final report of the field test discussed this coordinating role as a vital factor in assuring the success of cooperative or jointly administered projects.

With this in mind, a significant focus of the follow-up study was upon the degree of continuing cooperation of the state and local education and welfare agencies in launching and maintaining joint mutually funded programs for those who participated in the field test and others who were screened for the field test but did not participate.

A. State Level

The period following the field test witnessed a significant decrease in the amount of contact between the adult education agencies and social welfare agencies at the state level in at least two of the states. The field test had necessitated education and welfare cooperation in matters pertaining to funding and program guidance, but the agencies felt that once the field test research project had been concluded their joint responsibilities were at an end.

In these two states some contact had been maintained, but little of it was concerned with joint planning for current or future programs. It would appear that each agency has gone its own way in formulating programs. At least part of this resulted from the nature of the programs. The Title V welfare program involved not only the provision of adult basic education for welfare recipients, but also work experience and job training opportunities. The usual manner of obtaining the necessary educational services was through arrangements with county adult education directors through Title II-B, and more recently Title III of ESEA. Programs in each case were planned at the county agency level and submitted for approval to their respective state-level agencies. They were then incorporated into the overall state plans. In some instances where the county education agency could not or would not provide necessary educational services, the county Title V agency purchased them from private schools.

In effect, there was little evidence of joint planning across agency lines at the state level, except for crisis contact when funding date differences threatened the existence of joint programs. There was general admission by state officials in both agencies of a good many unresolved problems in the launching and maintenance of joint programs. These problems related to timing, funding, the selection of materials, teacher selection and training, class structuring and curricula selection.

In the third state, it was admitted that the impetus of the field test had created a situation which encouraged adult educators to focus on the poor, to learn how to recruit persons from the poverty group, to learn how to work with other agencies (especially welfare), and to change their attitudes toward education of the poverty group. Many joint meetings have been held between the state adult education agency and the state welfare department to discuss financing of ABE classes, recruitment of welfare clients, and the education and training needed in their counties. There is recognition that these programs are crucial and that ways must be found to continue them when Title V and other funds have disappeared. But even in this state, where meaningful dialogue is taking place, the absence of adequate, centralized funding for cooperative programs hampers their ability to really work together.

This is not to say that the individual agencies in each of the states are not aware of the inadequacies of existing programs and how they can be improved. Much thought is being given by the adult education agencies to the development of new curricula for students to be assigned to ABE programs in the future. There is also recognition that the training of teachers for ABE programs of different scope and for different participants is essential. Flexible programming, different types of classroom organization, and employment-related subject matter are being given consideration.

In one of the states, significant progress has been made in this direction by the establishment of four adult education resource centers at state colleges in different parts of the state. The primary purpose of these centers is to provide assistance in the preparation of teachers of adult education, as well as educational services to other personnel involved in adult educational activity. Assistance to local agencies involved in adult education has taken the following form:

...Making available to educational institutions, resource centers, community groups, and interested personnel, a program for designated teachers to enhance and establish competency in teaching and counseling adults

...Making available to educational institutions and community groups consultant services in adult education

...Establishing a library and information center for adult education, both curricula and teacher-instructional

...Reviewing and evaluating curriculum materials for continuing education

...Planning for college courses which would include adult education methods and materials to be offered at both undergraduate and graduate levels, such courses to be designed to increase the competency of teachers of adults

...Conducting special activities directed at the improvement of resources and training of teachers who will be involved in adult programs

...Providing evaluative services relating to the effectiveness of adult education programs

...Conducting research programs

In addition, one university in the state has been designated to assume responsibility for the training of adult education supervisors and administrators.

Although it is still too early to gauge the effects of this state effort to upgrade the role and quality of adult education, it is undoubtedly a significant step in the right direction.

In the same state, the Title V officials feel that basic education for a poverty population presents a unique problem which needs the skills and knowledge of the welfare department in the areas of understanding the population, maintaining services, counseling and guidance, and follow-up support. Without these elements, they feel that educational effort for the functionally illiterate poor will fail. It is also their feeling that an essential part of an adult basic education teacher's training should be in gaining awareness of what it means to be poor, illiterate, and on welfare, not merely a superficial understanding of this population, but a thorough one. Teacher selection should be predicated on the ability of the teacher to understand and relate to this disadvantaged group. Finally, welfare feels quite strongly that it should assume an educational role in the preparation of such teachers.

Although in general, state interagency cooperation has been minimal, the agencies themselves were most supportive and helpful to their own county counterparts in furnishing guidance and technical assistance in the administration of programs.

Perhaps the problem of state-level interagency cooperation should be viewed in the following light. In joint programs subsequent to the field test, there hasn't been an effective third party to pull the agencies together. Nor was either one of the agencies designated to assume the overall administration of programs. Each was separately funded and in turn allocated funds separately to their local agency counterparts. Each had a distinctive role; Title V was to make welfare recipients employable; education was to upgrade language ability and skills. Each had its own budget and built-in administrative guidelines. Under these circumstances, close cooperative efforts are not encouraged. It is too much to expect that they will materialize on their own. Suggestions for effecting desirable agency coordination are to be found in the chapter on recommendations.

B. County Level

Six separate counties were involved in the field test as well as in the follow-up study in the three states: New Jersy's Camden and Passaic, New York's Onondaga, Utica and Nassau, and California's Contra Costa. The six counties were represented by individual county welfare departments and Title V agencies and multiple school districts within most counties.

In general, the county agencies, with the exception of those in one state, felt that the field test had been a unique research-oriented program which had been promulgated by the states, and that with its conclusion their responsibility to the participants was at an end. This was reflected in the fact that those educational and training programs for welfare recipients organized following the field test were not restricted to the graduates of the field test program; rather, the agencies recruited those whom they felt could be employable after a short period of training.

Furthermore, the elaborate machinery for interagency cooperation on the county level which had been organized for the field test effort broke down.

Title V and adult education proposals were drafted separately without consultation between them. The funding periods were different, and therefore in at least two counties adult education had funds for classes, attempted to get them started, but found that welfare had no Title V funds and was unable to recruit students for adult education without stipends and supportive services. In other counties, classes which had been full time were cut to a half day or several two-hour, two-evenings-a-week schedules.

One county which had involved six school districts in the field test was reduced to two school districts, because the adult education directors were reluctant to continue even though the funding was available. It appears that the state agency which was eager to maintain the programs was unable to persuade the school districts which have local autonomy.

Those adult educators who did continue to work with the welfare department in that county are enthusiastic about the results of the partnership. Regularly scheduled meetings between welfare and Title V, the utilization of community aides for recruitment and follow-up have been positive aspects of the continuing, although weakened, program.

Some adult educators in this county resent the stipends welfare recipients receive, feeling that it is a "handout" and believe it to be detrimental to adult education. A more extremist view held by farmers in another section of the county prevents the establishment of daytime ABE for Mexican-American field hands. The farmers control the political situation and are not interested in changing the status quo: having a large number of available hands for field labor. Education and skill training for Mexican-Americans could result in demands for higher wages or migration to other areas where better paid, more skilled occupations are available. This situation has been confirmed by a number of social welfare officials as well as a former field test participant, now the director of an OEO community services project for Spanish-speaking persons. It was also alleged that although Federal grants to assist farmers have been readily approved in this area, the Federal programs to assist Mexican-Americans in the poverty group have been turned down consistently by the farmer-dominated council.

Great diversity of effort and involvement exists among the counties of another state. One which organized 24 classes for the field test in 5 separate school districts currently has 4 ABE classes operating in 2 school districts. This occurred not because need decreased, but rather because of the lack of cooperation between the welfare department and the adult educators. Education indicated it neither had the resources nor the money to recruit welfare recipients for ABE; when welfare was asked to cooperate in recruiting students, it ignored the requests. Even in those classes which are currently running, there has been little liaison and no sharing of information or planning to insure continuation of ABE.

Adult education directors are particularly bitter about this lack of cooperation because of the large number of functional illiterates in minority groups who need basic education in this county.

The work experience program of the welfare department's Title V is ludicrously small, involving some 65 persons at any one time, with the majority of offerings in homemaking and vocational adjustment. These demand as an entrance prerequisite at least an eighth-grade reading level. In essence, this fails to involve the hard-core functionally illiterate and leaves out the vast majority of those formerly involved in the field test, most of whom were well-motivated and eager to continue.

By contrast, the other counties in this state which were involved in the field test continued their cooperative agency efforts. One of these still has the broadest based ABE program of any of the communities in the field test and has involved a large segment of the field test participants in their ABE classes. The relations between education and welfare have been excellent, and full-time students have received all the supportive assistance (including stipends, child care and transportation allowances), necessary to maintain themselves in educational training. Of particular note is the on-training-site cooperation of welfare, Title V and education; this close working relationship permits daily, non-crisis oriented contact which assures program strength and continuity for the students.

Although education oriented, the Title V program in this county has several segments which include "work stations" at various county governmental agencies and OEO offices, and entry into MDTA vocational skills programs.

The other county in this state has a strong Title V program which includes part-time basic education and work experience and training in cooperation with municipal sponsors--state, county and city--who provide training slots. In addition, very good liaison exists with MDTA, and a good number of trainees have been enrolled in a variety of skill training programs. Some field test participants have been involved in these programs, but the majority have not been recruited because the educational prerequisites are beyond their level. Hence, for the study population, the programs have been disappointing.

Although the Title V effort is tightly structured, there is little contact with county education officials who view ABE as a stepchild of the school system. An appointed ABE coordinator is responsible for administration, supervision, and coordination, but her relations are mainly with Title V rather than education. In effect she receives no technical assistance and guidance from the education agency.

Despite the view held by the state regional welfare personnel, who maintain close contact with this county's Title V effort, that the program is outstanding in terms of direction and outcomes, it has failed to reach the hard-core functionally illiterate population.

The two counties in the third state represent interesting diversities in structure of their programs and in their agency relationships. The Title V welfare agency for each county was organized differently. In one, the Title V manager and his staff were housed in the county welfare office and were immediately responsible to the director of welfare who took an active interest in the planning and execution of the Title V program which he supported and encouraged. In the other county, the Title V agency was organized separately from the county welfare office because the director chose not to lend his office to its support. It has operated on its own with minimum support from the county welfare office and has reported to and dealt directly with the state Title V office. In effect it has closer ties with the state office than the Title V agency in the other county.

The ABE programs in both counties are run by full-time adult education directors who coordinate all adult and community programs for their designated areas. But here their similarity ceases to exist.

In one county, the ABE classes are set up in cooperation with the Title V agency which is responsible for recruitment of adult students. Scheduling of classes, the number of hours, the opening and closing dates are arranged jointly. In so far as possible, ABE funding is coordinated with Title V funding.

Curriculum content, materials, selection of teachers are viewed as educational functions, and until recently Title V had no voice in decisions in these areas. Now the Title V agency suggests content materials and audio-visual aids which it feels would be useful in coordinating ABE with their training programs. The relationship between these two agencies has improved as the programs have continued.

In the second county, the cooperation between Title V and local education is negligible. The adult education director is not receptive to running ABE classes and has had to be prodded by Title V to request ABE funding. The Title V agency has had to do most of the planning for the classes, assist with the recruitment of teachers, and suggest materials. For some of its clerical training it has had to purchase instruction from private schools because it was not made available through the local education facilities. In this county, the state adult education division has worked closely with Title V rather than the adult education director whom they found recalcitrant.

A variety of work training experiences exist in both these counties. One has concentrated on nurses aide training, department store sales, and stock clerk training, while the other, whose major focus is education, has concentrated on industrial training slots such as needle trades and electronic assembly, and on clerical training positions.

C. Summary

It is necessary to indicate that the erosion of interagency cooperation on all levels was to a large extent caused by the problems and crises within the individual agencies themselves.

In several counties there was an acute absence of professionally trained staff in the Title V agencies, and although the sincerity and dedication of the agency personnel were beyond reproach, they were not trained to plan and administer complex programs involving hundreds of persons and hundreds of thousands of dollars. It would be unfair not to mention that they received few guidelines and little technical assistance from the state and regional levels to help meet their problems.

Adult basic education was grafted on to the ongoing adult education programs and represented only a small segment of the overall adult education focus. The adult education directors were generally not geared to working with a disadvantaged, functionally illiterate population, and certainly not in concert with other agencies. Nor were they prepared in terms of materials, staff, and the ability to render adequate training and supervision for the teachers in dealing with this population. As a result there has been little innovation in selecting and producing materials, rearranging curriculum content, and upgrading teacher skills and knowledge.

No central agency existed to adequately test and counsel participants in the directions of their best capabilities for success. The Title V staff had neither the competency nor the time for this function; the education agency was interested primarily in grade-level achievement, divorced from the realities of work training requirements.

Follow-up services by both agencies were minimal because of lack of staff. In those cases where a participant became employed, it was quite possible for him to be unemployed the following week without the agency being aware of it, unless he applied for welfare again.

Although the programs were largely female oriented, many of the women were really not interested in work experience opportunities because of family responsibilities. Nevertheless they desperately needed education for other purposes. It was difficult to move this population toward employment, which became the focus of Title V programs.

The complexities of funding caused innumerable delays in getting money down to the local level. Stipends and child-care allowances were often late. Participants were discouraged by these delays, which ultimately resulted in their poor attendance, resentment, and dropping out of programs.

The absence of joint funding of the programs was an overriding weakness because of the delays and lack of coordination. Without planned, joint-agency funding for similar funding periods, there could be no meaningful cooperation between agencies. Lacking agency cooperation, the programs were riddled with inefficiency and lack of direction and planning.

Despite the inadequacies of the programs following the field test, some surprising success stories have evolved, the successes can be characterized as highly motivated participants who realized their potentials and reordered their lives. There is little question that given strong, supportive, imaginative, participant-focused programs, the success stories could be legion.

V. FINDINGS: EDUCATIONAL AND TRAINING IMPACT

This chapter concerns itself with the study population's involvement in educational and/or training programs and the impact these programs may have had on their lives. It deals with the degree of involvement of the different groups in the study, the kinds of programs they were enrolled in and the problems associated with participating in the programs.

The findings, including reading score data, have been described and tabulated, and conclusions have been formed about their significance. Additional findings of a descriptive nature, taken from field interviewers' reports and from interviews with former field test teachers, have been included.

The first portion of the findings presents selected demographic characteristics of the study population.

A. Characteristics of the Study Population

1. Sex, Ethnicity and Age

Of the 1,640 persons interviewed in the first period, 82 percent were female and 18 percent were male.

The overwhelming majority of the respondents in each group were Negro. The ethnic composition for Group III (overqualified) was slightly different than those of Group I (field test participants) and Group II (nonparticipants). Group III had fewer Negroes and Spanish-Americans and almost twice as many whites as the other two groups. The percentages of Negroes, whites and Spanish-Americans in Group III, were 53, 34 and 12 percent respectively. The decreasing ratio of Negroes and Spanish-Americans as compared to whites in Group III appears significant. It demonstrates that the higher the educational level of welfare recipients as a group, the less the disadvantaged minority are represented in the group. Functional illiteracy is a particularly egregious problem of the disadvantaged minority groups.

Although there were wide differences in ethnic background among the three groups, there were very small differences among them with regard to age distribution. The majority of the respondents, approximately 75 percent, were over 30 years of age.

Table 34

Sex, Ethnicity, and Age of Respondents, by Group: Interview Period 1 (in percents)

Characteristics	Total	Groups I	Groups II	Groups III
Total number	(1640)	(918)	(205)	(517)
Total percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
I. Sex				
Male	18.0	23.0	15.0	11.0
Female	82.0	77.0	85.0	89.0
II. Ethnicity				
Total number	(1640)	(918)	(205)	(517)
Total percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Negro	61.0	65.0	66.0	53.0
White	20.0	14.0	13.0	34.0
Spanish-American	17.0	20.0	19.0	12.0
Other	2.0	1.0	2.0	1.0
III. Age				
Total number	(1630)	(914)	(203)	(513)
Total percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
30 years and younger	27.0	25.0	23.0	23.0
Over 30 years of age	73.0	75.0	77.0	77.0

2. Place of Birth and Residence

The majority of respondents in Groups I and II were born in the southern United States: 62 percent in Group I, 61 percent in Group II, and 44 percent in Group III. However, a sizeable percentage were born in Puerto Rico and Mexico. There is little doubt that place of birth, and perhaps even more so, place where educated, contributed to the higher functional illiteracy rate among Negroes and Spanish-Americans.

In all three groups, the data on residence indicate that a large proportion of the interviewees had lived in the same state for a good part of their mature lives. Approximately 18 percent had lived in the same state for five to nine years, and 56 percent for ten years or more, or since birth.

Table 35

Place of Birth of Respondents, by Group: Interview Period 1 (in percents)

Place of Birth	Total	Groups I	Groups II	Groups III
Total number	(1624)	(909)	(204)	(514)
Total percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
New Jersey	11.0	6.0	7.0	20.0
New York	7.0	1.0	1.0	12.0
California	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Puerto Rico	10.0	11.0	13.0	7.0
Mexico	2.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Northeastern U.S. (excluding New York or New Jersey)	3.0	2.0	2.0	7.0
Southern U.S.	56.0	62.0	61.0	44.0
Western U.S. (excluding California)	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
North Central U.S.	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Other area outside U.S.	4.0	1.0	6.0	4.0

Table 36

Length of Time in Present State, by Group: Interview Period 1 (in percents)

Length of Time in Present State	Total	Groups I	Groups II	Groups III
Total number	(1631)	(915)	(203)	(513)
Total percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Since birth	17.0	10.0	12.0	17.0
Less than 5 years	9.0	11.0	7.0	9.0
Five years but less than 10 years	18.0	20.0	11.0	18.0
Ten years but less than 20 years	31.0	35.0	23.0	31.0
Twenty years or more	25.0	24.0	27.0	25.0

3. Family Characteristics

The three groups did not differ significantly with regard to their marital status and number of children in the household. Group III tended to have slightly fewer married individuals than Groups I or II and slightly more individuals who indicated they were separated, deserted, or divorced.

The number of children in the household in each group ranged from two to five and the average number of children per household was approximately 3.5.

Table 37

Marital Status of Respondents, by Group:
Interview Period 1 (in percents)

Marital Status	Total	Group I	Group II	Group III
Total number	(1639)	(918)	(205)	(516)
Total percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Single	12.0	12.0	12.0	12.0
Married	30.0	34.0	33.0	23.0
Separated/deserted	43.0	39.0	44.0	49.0
Divorced	7.0	6.0	4.0	10.0
Widowed	8.0	9.0	7.0	6.0

Table 38

Number of Children in Household, by Group:
Interview Period 1 (in percents)

Number of Children	Total	Groups I	Groups II	Groups III
Total number	(1641)	(919)	(205)	(517)
Total percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
None	11.0	13.0	11.0	9.0
One	12.0	12.0	10.0	12.0
Two-three	33.0	31.0	31.0	37.0
Four-five	25.0	24.0	24.0	26.0
Six-seven	12.0	13.0	17.0	9.0
Eight or more	7.0	6.0	7.0	7.0

4. Educational Background

The educational background varied by group. Some 5 percent of the interviewees in Group I never attended school or never completed the first grade, as opposed to 1 percent in Group II. In Group III there were none who had never attended school.

On the whole, Group II had a higher educational background than Group I. For example, 27 percent in Group II had completed some high school, compared to 20 percent in Group I. As would be expected, even though a direct relationship has not been established between educational attainment and reading level, Group III had the largest proportion of those who had completed at least nine years of schooling (56 percent).

It is significant that Group III's educational attainment showed greater correlation of educational grade level and reading level than did Group I's. In Group I 68 percent had five or more years of schooling, yet all of these scored below fifth grade on the reading test. In Group III 94 percent had five years or more of schooling, and none of these scored below fifth grade. The contributing factors in Group I's lack of correlation between grade level and reading level are probably the place of birth and quality of schooling received.

Table 39

Highest Grade Completed, by Group:
Interview Period 1 (in percents)

Highest Grade Completed	Total	Groups I	Groups II	Groups III
Total number	(1633)	(915)	(203)	(515)
Total percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
None	3.0	5.0	1.0	-
1-4 years	20.0	28.0	21.0	5.0
5 years	7.0	9.0	8.0	3.0
6-8 years	38.0	38.0	10.0	35.0
9-11 years	25.0	16.0	21.0	42.0
12 years or more	7.0	4.0	6.0	14.0

B. Involvement in Educational and/or Training Programs

Following the field test, some of the participants (Group I) became involved in further education and training programs in those states where plans had been developed for them by Title V and the education agencies. Groups II and III, to a lesser extent, were also involved in educational and/or training programs. The involvement of particular segments of these groups depended upon the program orientation.

Because of the research design of the field test, only those welfare recipients who scored below 4.9 on the reading test used for screening were permitted to participate. To a large extent, the field test participants were not eligible for the usual Title V programs, which demanded higher educational achievement levels, usually beginning at eighth-grade level. Other restrictions for Title V programs limited family size and demanded definite employable status for participants.

These restrictions were waived for participants in the field test, but after the field test there was a return to the strict interpretation of Title V regulations. Consequently, a large majority of field test participants were unable to qualify for the subsequent Title V programs in most communities. (A fuller discussion of these implications will be found in Chapter IV.) This point is made here as background to those sections which deal with the findings of the follow-up interviews with respect to the impact of whatever subsequent education or training did follow.

It was not in the realm of the collected data to provide an answer as to why Group I became more involved than Groups II and III, but several conclusions can be drawn. First, in at least one state, plans had been made to continue the field test participants in subsequent programs. Second, Group I may have been more motivated to become involved than the other two groups, and this motivation may have resulted from their exposure to the field test classes. Finally, Group I had become more aware of existing programs and recognized the benefits, financial and otherwise, of being involved.

In analyzing data from the first interview period with regard to involvement in additional educational and/or training programs following the field test, it was found that more than one-half (57 percent) of the individuals in Group I were involved in a program, as opposed to 30 percent in Group III and 9 percent in Group II. It must be remembered that Group II represents those who were qualified to participate in the field test but either dropped out after one or two days of classes or chose not to enroll in classes.

During the second interview period, information was sought on how many new persons had become involved in a program since the first interview period six months earlier. These were persons who were involved in programs at the time of the first interview period. Some 24 percent in Group I, 22 percent in Group III and 7 percent in Group II had become involved.

1. Basic Literacy Programs

Following the field test, 570 persons from all Groups were involved in subsequent educational programs. This represents approximately 35 percent of the 1,641 persons interviewed during the first interview period.

Some 483, or 85 percent, of the 570 further involved in educational programs were in basic literacy. Most of these were persons from Group I. The data from the first interview period show that approximately 81 percent of those in basic literacy were from Group I, and somewhat surprisingly, 18 percent were from Group III. Group III's involvement indicates that a reading level below 4.9 was no longer a prerequisite for entry into basic literacy programs.

In specifically examining the Groups' status in the basic literacy program during the first interview period, it was found that there was very little difference among the Groups with regard to whether individuals dropped out of literacy programs, completed, or were still in attendance.

During the second interview period, a total of 310 were found to be involved in educational and/or training programs. Of these, 71 percent were involved in basic literacy programs. Of those who were in basic literacy, 75 percent were in Group I, 22 percent were in Group III, and 3 percent were in Group II. As was true in the first interview period, there were very small differences among the Groups with regard to their status in the basic education program. Group I tended to have slightly more individuals who were still attending, slightly more who dropped out, and fewer individuals who completed than did Group III.

Table 40

Status in Basic Literacy Programs, by Group: Interview Period 1 (in percents)

		Groups [a/]	
Status in Basic Literacy	Total	I	III
Total number	(483)	(393)	(86)
Total percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Dropped out	21.0	16.0	28.0
Completed	53.0	44.0	48.0
Still attending	26.0	20.0	24.0

[a/] Group II was excluded from the table because there were only four persons who were in a basic literacy program and all four were still attending.

Table 41

Status in Basic Literacy Programs, by Group:
Interview Period 2 (in percents)

Status in Basic Literacy	Total	Groups[a/] I	III
Total numbers	(220)	(164)	(49)
Total percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Dropped out	22.0	24.0	16.0
Completed	14.0	9.0	33.0
Still attending	64.0	67.0	51.0

[a/] Group II was excluded from the table because only seven persons were involved.

---

2. Other Types of Educational Programs

In the first interview period, a total of 87 persons or 15 percent of the 570 persons further involved in education participated in programs other than basic literacy. These programs included vocational literacy, vocational training and GED (high school equivalency). As would be expected, because of the requirements of these programs, there were more people from Group III involved than from Groups I or II. The number involved for Groups I, II and III were 35, 3 and 49 respectively. Of the 25 persons who were in GED, 18 were in Group III. But there were 7 from Group I, indicating that although functionally illiterate a year earlier, it was possible through basic literacy training for a limited number to qualify for high school work.

In the second interview period 90 persons, or some 29 percent, of the 310 involved were in other types of programs. Again as was true during the first interview period, there were more individuals involved from Group III than from the other two Groups. The number involved for Groups I, II, and III were 38, 2 and 50 respectively. Of the 28 who were involved in GED, 21 were in Group III, 6 in Group I and 1 in Group II.

Table 42

Number Involved in Other Types of Programs, by Group:
Interview Period 1

Type of Program	Total	Groups I	II	III
Total number	87	35	3	49
Vocational literacy	13	9	-	4
Vocational training	49	19	3	27
GED	25	7	-	18

Table 43

Number Involved in Other Types of Programs, by Group:
Interview Period 2

Type of Program	Total	Groups I	Groups II	Groups III
Total number	90	38	2	50
Vocational literacy	10	10	-	-
Vocational training	52	22	1	29
GED	28	6	1	21

3. Some Observations About Adult Basic Education by Former Field Test Teachers

Eighteen former field test teachers who were still teaching adult basic education were interviewed in order to obtain information concerning the attitudes and opinions they had formed as a result of their experiences in the field test and in ABE classes following the field test.

Interviews were held with teachers of all levels: certified teachers, college graduates without teacher training, and high school graduates. The majority of the teachers in the field test were females. The teachers interviewed were representative of this population.

All the teachers concluded that the ABE classes were beneficial and should be continued. Overall, the attitude of the teachers can be described as one of interest in moving disadvantaged adults into higher literacy levels.

Many teachers thought the reading systems assigned for the field test were either too advanced or too elementary in content. The research criteria of the field test called for the use of specified reading systems and did not permit the flexibility which is to be encouraged in any normal teaching situation.

For the ABE classes following the field test, the teachers were generally able to select reading systems and methods that were more geared to the needs and interests of the students. One teacher said she preferred to use Reader's Digest and daily newspapers as reading selections because their content was more meaningful. Some teachers indicated that they discussed child development, food values, and community resources as part of general education, and used individual public assistance budgets as materials for teaching practical math.

In discussing class organization, teachers noted an important difference between ABE classes held during and after the field test. The design of the field test had not lent itself to having classes grouped according to reading level. But following the field test in areas where several classes continued, students were reassigned to classes according to reading level and this resulted in a more homogeneous grouping, enabling the teacher to concentrate on a narrower spectrum of reading abilities.

When questioned about their daily schedules, many teachers decried the fact that the full day of ABE divided into reading, social studies and arithmetic which prevailed during the field test was no longer in operation. In many instances, the class schedules were reduced to a four-hour program, two days a week. Social studies had been omitted entirely from some of the ABE classes and the curriculum had been divided into reading and math classes.

Comparing supervision following the field test with field test practices, the majority of teachers indicated that there was more supervision, though qualitatively it was more rigid in nature. It made administrative demands such as having lesson plans on display, handing in reports on time, and attendance at meetings which were characterized as lectures on minutiae. It provided a minimum of assistance in helping teachers to cope with the learning problems of their students.

Many of the teachers expressed the need for real down-to-earth inservice training which would upgrade their ability to teach disadvantaged adults. They wanted to learn how to teach reading skills and arithmetic skills, rather than follow predigested instructions in a publisher's package of materials. They also wanted to know more about the disadvantaged population they were teaching in order to understand their problems and to be able to relate to them better.

Teachers said they missed several positive features of the field test, such as the "coffee breaks" and the in-school lunch hour. This had encouraged teacher-student socialization and group interaction which carried over into the classrooms. It had permitted students to verbalize their own problems and perceive the problems of others. It had also given teachers insight into the lives of their students and had helped them to understand how to improve communication with their students. It had also resulted in stimulating students to perform as a group and to assist each other in class.

Because of the curtailed program, teachers were less involved with students' problems than they had been during the field test. This estrangement resulted in a reduction of teacher-student interaction. Relations became more formal and rapport became more difficult to obtain.

On the whole, teachers did not observe significantly different academic achievement patterns among the students in their current classes as compared with those in the field test classes.

Teachers also corroborated the findings of the field test in respect to other kinds of achievements, such as:

... an increase in awareness of community resources

... an increase in personality development

... an increase in self-confidence

... an increase in awareness of the importance of learning

These achievements were also noticeable among the students in current ABE classes.

C. Attitudes Toward Involvement in Programs

In the first interview period, the respondents indicated that they had gained many skills and improved themselves personally as a result of their involvement in the various programs following the field test. These areas ranged from improvement in English or reading skills to improvement in self-confidence. The majority of responses from each of the three groups indicated improvements in basic skills such as reading and arithmetic. These same patterns of responses were also present in the second interview period.

Table 44

Gains Reported as the Result of the Programs, by Group: Interview Period 1 (in percents)

Gains Reported	Total Responses	Groups I	II	III
Total number	(1588)	(1299)	(44)	(315)
Total percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Improved English skills	3.0	3.0	2.0	1.0
Nothing	2.0	2.0	5.0	1.0
New job skills	9.0	8.0	18.0	15.0
Reading skills	27.0	29.0	18.0	22.0
Arithmetic skills	22.0	21.0	13.0	24.0
Current events	5.0	5.0	2.0	8.0
Friends	5.0	6.0	7.0	3.0
Confidence in self	13.0	13.0	16.0	10.0
Adjust to new program	3.0	2.0	7.0	4.0
Other	11.0	11.0	11.0	15.0

Table 45

Gains Reported as the Result of the Programs, by Group: Interview Period 2 (in percents)

Gains Reported	Total Responses	Groups I	II	III
Total number	(1012)	(695)	(23)	(294)
Total percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Improved English skills	19.0	20.0	30.0	15.0
Nothing	1.0	1.0	10.0	1.0
New job skills	6.0	4.0	10.0	10.0
Reading skills	21.0	23.0	22.0	17.0
Arithmetic skills	19.0	19.0	13.0	19.0
Current events	8.0	8.0	10.0	8.0
Friends	5.0	5.0	-	5.0
Confidence in self	12.0	11.0	10.0	14.0
Other	9.0	8.0	17.0	11.0

It is evident that the category "new job skills" did not receive many responses indicating gains. In fact, in all three states field interviewers found a rather uniform negative attitude toward work experience and training programs.

The respondents had felt that involvement in a program would provide skill upgrading and the promise of better jobs, but the majority of women who were in training programs were actually offered little more than training in housekeeping and domestic work. The case of Mrs. B. illustrates this type of frustration:

> When the interview began, I sensed that Mrs. B. was very angry, and it turned out to be more than the fact that she was tired after returning from work. The respondent had felt angered that at her first assignment she expected to be trained as a nurses aides, but it turned out to be housekeeping. It was also difficult to have to work so hard for only $41.25 a month when, in fact, the assignment was not training at all.

Most of the female respondents had a long history of this kind of employment and could see little promise in pursuing "training" of this nature. The consensus was that no real skill upgrading was offered and the jobs the respondents obtained following this training were those they could have obtained by themselves.

In one county there was keen disappointment by a group, who had been involved in stock clerk and sales training, who found that at the end of the training period they were not given employment. The employer-trainer selected one or two trainees while the rest were let go. Another wave of trainees came in to take their places. Respondents felt that in fact it was a method the employer was using to secure free labor.

Some work experience programs (WEP) were of the "make work" variety. Participants' experience with this type of program were extremely frustrating. Typical of some of these is the following:

> Mr. W. had been a foundry worker for many years and had been able to support his family until he had lost his job because of mechanization. When the Field Test came along, he looked forward to it, although he resented being threatened with loss of assistance if he did not attend. He was told he would get a job after the program. When he was assigned to WEP he was disappointed because he had been promised a full-time job. He was told he would receive a $65 stipend, but he received only $45. This was another disappointment. His first WEP assignment was to have been training in auto mechanics, but this assignment turned out to be washing school buses. This project was dropped by WEP. Next Mr. W. was assigned to work with the park department picking up paper and trash in the city parks. Then he was put on janitor duties in the housing project where he lives, and then was shifted to similar duties in another housing project. He was never consulted -- just ordered from one assignment to another. He received no training of any kind on any of the assignments, and felt that anyone without education or training could easily do the work he did. He was also very disappointed in the 2 hours of classes he had to attend each day. He learned nothing new, was extremely bored, and stated that everything covered in class was repetition of what had been taught during the Field Test.

A work-relief program sponsored by welfare in another county involving the clearing of debris and weeds in drainage ditches was bitterly assailed by those respondents engaged in it as demeaning and unproductive in terms of making them employable. Following are two examples of the futility felt by participants in this project:

> This interviewee, Mr. C., is furious regarding his recent work (mandatory by welfare) on the flood control project. He

> reported again and again: I didn't have to go to school to be a ditch digger...I felt like I was in a chain gang.
>
> Mr. A. is a very angry and bitter man. Ever since getting out of school, he has been told that he can't get this or that job because he has no experience. And, no one will make it possible for him to gain that necessary experience. The last straw was his recent stint on flood control project (mandatory by county welfare). He asked the question: What kind of experience was that? What can I tell employers--that I'm a trained ditch digger?

Despite the overwhelming number of negative reactions toward involvement in training programs, a small number of respondents, highly motivated, used their field test experience and other skill training to change the economic course of their lives. Examples of the positive gains and attitudes of some of these respondents are reflected in the following cases:

> Prior to the field test, Mr. D, a Mexican immigrant, was turned down for numerous jobs because of his language handicap. Potential employers repeatedly told him that he needed to speak and understand English in order to be able to communicate with co-workers and with his bosses. Mr. D. is now employed in a well paying part-time job and has been off welfare for several months. He is fiercely independent by nature and is optimistic about his economic future in the United States for the first time.
>
> Mr. F. demonstrated encouraging movement since his field test experience. After the field test, he enrolled in a skills center and, while he enjoyed the learning experience there, he left the course in order to take one of three jobs he was offered. He seems very pleased with his position on the maintenance staff of United Airlines, and he views this objectively as a "ground floor" job which he hopes will lead to a better position. He hopes to take advantage of on-the-job training programs which will qualify him for a better position.
>
> Mr. R. is of the opinion that the field test was the turning point in his adult life. In many crucial areas he has made tremendous movement. For example:
>
> 1. He has completed his GED, and is planning for a year and a half of college starting January 1967.

2. He has selected his new work career. These plans seem to be finalized; namely, six months at Police Academy after college work and then a job in State Highway Patrol (starting salary $600 per month plus).
3. He has become an active and vocal member of his community.
4. He has already moved his family into better housing and has become a much more active parent.

In his own words, the onset of interview, Mr. R. stated loudly and clearly: "The field test changed my whole life."

Mr. P.'s progress since the field test is the most encouraging I have encountered. Following the field test training, Mr. P. was involved in a work experience program in which he did well, and was employed as a city gardener. He says this is a temporary position, but the employment has lasted for nine months. Apparently on his own, Mr. P. completed a one month evening course in plant diseases at a local college. He is anxious to take the test which would qualify him for permanent status on his present job. He is also anxious to gain more education.

To a great extent the quality of the work experience and training programs depended upon interagency cooperation and planning. This subject is discussed in detail in Chapter IV.

The majority of the respondents who were involved in further education and/or training programs did not have negative attitudes towards the programs as a whole, but there were some particular complaints. In the second interview period among those who had become involved in a program following the first interview period, 169, or 43 percent, indicated no negative reaction to the programs. For those who did give some negative reactions:

... 23 or 6 percent mentioned location of facilities

... 27 or 7 percent mentioned class grouping

... 23 or 6 percent mentioned that program did not relate to their needs

... 18 or 5 percent mentioned the type of materials used

... 14 or 4 percent mentioned insufficient supply of materials or inadequate facilities

... 17 or 4 percent mentioned negative reactions to the teachers

... 14 or 4 percent mentioned negative reactions to the teaching methods

... 21 or 6 percent felt the program was too short (in time)

... 53 or 13 percent mentioned other problems such as late payment of stipends, inadequate lunchroom facilities, transportation, etc.

It is worthwhile to note that transportation problems and the late payment of stipends were two of the major problems also mentioned by field test teachers interviewed in the follow-up as deterrents to attendance, and consequently, continuity of programs.

The majority of the respondents (65 percent) in the first interview period who were not involved in further educational and/or training programs indicated that they desired to become involved. In examining the distribution by Groups in the first interview period, it was found that 73 percent in Group I, 44 percent in Group II and 62 percent in Group III wanted to become involved in educational and/or training programs. It is significant to note that Group II people, those who were qualified to participate in the field test but chose not to, did not have as great a desire to become involved in programs as did Group I or Group III people.

In the second interview period, the desire to become involved did not differ greatly from the first interview period, as the following indicates:

... 55 percent in Group I

... 36 percent in Group II

... 48 percent in Group III

Most of the persons who were not involved in education and/or training programs but wanted to become involved desired to do so in order to acquire additional skill training. Some 44 percent of the responses from the first interview period indicated an interest in acquiring additional skill training from the programs, and 33 percent showed interest in obtaining additional education. There was very little difference among the three Groups.

Table 46

Reasons for Wanting to Become Involved in Education and/or Training Programs, by Group: Interview Period 1 (in percents)

Reasons	Total Responses	Groups 1	Groups II	Groups III
Total number	(2061)	(1224)	(179)	(658)
Total percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
To gain additional education	33.0	35.0	36.0	29.0
To acquire additional skill training	44.0	42.0	42.0	50.0
To meet people	4.0	5.0	2.0	3.0
To learn new things	12.0	13.0	7.0	12.0
Other	6.0	5.0	12.0	6.0

In ascertaining the reasons why those people who were not involved did not aspire to become involved in education and/or training programs, it was found that some 30 percent of the responses from the first interview period indicated that these people were "needed at home." The category "needed at home" included reasons of child care and illness of other members in the family. Another major reason for not wanting to become involved was illness of the interviewee. On the whole, only 9 percent of the responses in the first interview period indicated "not interested" as a reason for not wanting to become involved.

It is significant to note that 13 percent of the responses related to unavailability of schooling. Fourteen percent of the responses from Group I and 15 percent of the responses from Group III indicated that schooling was not available, while only 7 percent of Group II responses indicated that schooling was not available. The major problem of child care responsibilities as a reason for not wanting to become involved is further indicative of the necessity of supportive services in order for this population to be able to participate in the necessary programs for the upgrading of their educational and vocational skills.

Upon examination of reasons given in the second interview period for not wanting to become involved, it is evident that a slightly higher proportion of the responses, 25 percent, indicated illness of respondent as a reason, and 18 percent, as opposed to 9 percent, in the first interview period, mentioned lack of interest. Some 20 percent, as opposed to 14 percent in the first interview period, mentioned the necessity to work as a reason for not becoming involved.

Table 47

Reasons for Not Wanting to Participate in Education and/or Training Programs, by Group: Interview Period 1 (in percents)

Reasons	Total Responses	Groups I	Groups II	Groups III
Total number	(1473)	(674)	(261)	(538)
Total percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Necessity to work	14.0	14.0	15.0	14.0
Needed at home	30.0	25.0	34.0	32.0
Lack of money	12.0	17.0	3.0	10.0
Not interested	9.0	7.0	15.0	10.0
Illness	18.0	20.0	21.0	15.0
Too old	3.0	3.0	5.0	3.0
Schooling unavailable	13.0	14.0	7.0	15.0

Table 48

Reasons for Not Wanting to Participate in Education and/or Training Programs, by Group: Interview Period 2 (in percents)

Reasons	Total Responses	Groups I	Groups II	Groups III
Total number	(679)	(322)	(132)	(225)
Total percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Necessity to work	20.0	25.0	14.0	16.0
Needed at home	29.0	27.0	30.0	32.0
Lack of money	1.0	1.0	1.0	2.0
Not interested	18.0	16.0	19.0	20.0
Illness	25.0	26.0	27.0	23.0
Too old	7.0	5.0	9.0	7.0

D. Reading Gains and Retention, All Groups

Two of the primary objectives of the follow-up study were: 1)to examine the extent to which the reading skills of the participant Group have been retained and whether this retention relates in any way to level of teacher or to reading systems used in the field test, and 2) to compare reading levels of the participant Group with those of the nonparticipants. To achieve these objectives, the Gray's Oral Reading Paragraph Test score data for the different testing periods have been analyzed.

1. Field Test Screening (Initial Level)

To qualify for the field test classes, students had to be reading below the fifth-grade level as determined by the Gray's Oral Reading Paragraph Test. The mean reading levels at the outset of the field test for each of the three study groups were:

... 2.895 in Group I
... 2.896 in Group II
... 8.041 in Group III

The initial mean reading levels at the beginning of the field test for each of the study groups by state were:

Table 49

Mean Reading Scores, Field Test Screening Period (Initial Level) by State and Group

	Groups		
States	I	II	III
Total	2.895	2.896	8.041
New Jersey	2.995	2.879	8.323
New York	2.859	3.052	7.768
California	2.869	2.717	7.799

N=1,641

2. Gray's Oral Mean Reading Scores from First Interview Period

During the first interview period, the study population was again tested with the Gray's Oral Reading Paragraph Test in order to ascertain what changes in reading levels had occurred from the initial testing period to the first interview period, approximately 12 months later.

The overall mean reading levels achieved by the three groups in the first interview period were:

... 4.001 in Group I
... 3.966 in Group II
... 8.362 in Group III

It is evident that Group I and Group II had similar reading scores, despite the fact that Group II had not been exposed to the 17 weeks of field test classes.

Table 50

Mean Reading Scores, Interview Period 1
by State and Group

	Groups		
States	I	II	III
Total	4.001	3.966	8.362
New Jersey	4.700	4.088	8.810
New York	3.743	3.718	7.854
California	3.818	4.088	8.090

N =1,560

The average gains by Group from the initial to the first interview period as measured by the Gray's scores were:

... 1.046 grade level in Group I
... 0.911 grade level in Group II
... 0.339 grade level in Group III

On the average, Group I progressed by a 1.0 grade level, Group II progressed by a 0.9 grade level and Group III showed the least amount of gain.

The average gain from the initial to the first interview period by state and group are presented in the following table.

Table 51

Mean Reading Change Scores from Inital Testing Period to
Interview Period 1, by State and Group

	Groups		
States	I	II	III
Total	1.046	0.911	0.339
New Jersey	1.645	1.176	0.480
New York	0.824	0.374	1.184
California	0.915	1.184	0.312

N=1,545

3. Mean Reading Scores From Second Interview Period

During the second interview period, the study population was retested. The administering of this Gray's Oral occurred approximately six months after the first interview period. The overall mean reading levels for each of the three groups were:

... 3.979 in Group I
... 4.114 in Group II
... 8.249 in Group III

Groups I and II were again similar with respect to their mean reading levels. The actual mean reading levels at the time of the second interview period by state and group are presented in the following table.

Table 52

Mean Reading Scores, Interview Period 2
by State and Group

	Groups		
States	I	II	III
Total	3.979	4.114	8.249
New Jersey	4.599	4.806	8.598
New York	4.071	3.618	8.145
California	3.503	3.615	7.811

N=1,345

The average gains from the initial to the second interview period were:

... 1.089 grade level in Group I
... 1.158 grade level in Group II
... 0.312 grade level in Group III

It is evident that Groups I and II were similar with respect to their gains at this juncture, and in fact, that Group II may have had a slightly higher reading level than Group I. Group II's gain from the initial to the first interview period was 0.911, and from the initial to the second interview period it was 1.1. However, this may be accounted for by the degree of error in the test itself. The increase in the mean reading level of Group II raises questions about the extent to which a selection factor may have been presented and not accounted for. The fact that Group II chose not to participate in the field test indicates that they were different from Group I. In Group II some chose to go to work but others were too ill or burdened with home responsibilities to attend. In terms of socio-economic factors, they were similar to Group I. However, they may have had more basic motivation. This is indeterminable.

In examining the mean change from the initial to the first interview period in the reading scores of the 1,425 people who were interviewed in the second period, it is found that Group I had a slightly higher mean change score than did Group II.

The mean reading change scores from the initial testing period to interview period 1, by groups, follows:

... 1.154 in Group I
... 0.912 in Group II
... 0.339 in Group III

In examining mean change scores from the first to the second interview period by Group, it is found that Group III showed a decrease. That is, at the time of the second interview period, Group III was reading at a somewhat lower level than at the time of the first interview. It is important to indicate that the analysis of variance denotes that the mean change scores from the first to the second interview period are not significant at either the .01 or .05 levels of confidence. The mean change from the first to the second interview period by group was:

... 0.056 grade level in Group I
... 0.209 grade level in Group II
... 0.061 grade level in Group III

Overall, at the time of both interview periods, all of the three groups displayed that they were reading at a higher level than at the time of their initial testing period. At the same time, it is important to note that Group II, those who did not participate in the field test classes, performed as well as Group I, those who did participate in the 17 weeks of field test classes. These findings lead to several assumptions:

a. that the field test in itself was not the decisive factor in increasing the reading levels of groups;

b. that the Gray's Oral Test is not a valid instrument for purposes of consistent testing of reading levels; and

c. that the field test classes did have an impact on improving reading skills, but since Group II performed as well without attending classes, other factors such as self-improvement, employment, and exposure to other media of learning may be considered as instruments in improving reading ability.

An attempt was made to validate the latter assumption. Reading score data were analyzed with respect to employment status and involvement in additional education and/or training programs following the field test classes. There was no significant difference in reading scores for all Groups combined or for any one Group in relation to additional education or training. However, when employment was considered, there was a significant difference for all Groups combined for reading scores related to employment. This was significant at the .01 level of confidence. It is most important to stress that this difference was most marked in Group II. The employed persons in Group II had gained 2.8 grades while the unemployed had gained only 0.5. This latter gain could be accounted for by test error.

E. Reading Gains and Retention, Participant Group

One of the purposes of this study was to determine whether there was any differential retention of field test reading skill gains associated with reading system and level of teacher preparation. It was found that during the field test there were no significant differences in gain scores by these two factors as measured by a Gray's Oral Reading Paragraph Test. However, there were some who felt that changes related to teacher level might not occur until later. Some felt that the certified teacher would have laid a foundation for better retention. It should be kept in mind that the three levels of teacher preparation were:

... high school graduate
... college graduate
... certified teacher

and the four systems tested were:

... I - AIR (American Incentive to Read)
... II - SRA (Science Research Associates, Reading in High Gear)
...III - Mott (The Mott Basic Language Skills Program)
...IV - Follett (Systems for Success)

At each interview period a Gray's Oral Reading Paragraph Test was administered and an analysis of variance was used to determine whether there had been differential retention related to system or teacher level. No significant differences were found at either interview period.

1. Mean Change Scores from the Initial Testing Period Interview Period 1

In comparing mean change scores from the initial testing period to the first interview period by level of teacher preparation, system and state, the test of significance at the .01 level of confidence indicated that the only significant difference was by state. This difference was fairly large. There were no significant differences at the .01 or .05 levels for other variables, i.e., teacher level, system, or the combination of teacher level, system and state.

The following tables show the mean change scores from the initial testing peiod to first interview period by systems, teacher level and state. The gain scores in New Jersey tended to be higher than in the other states. This finding is of importance since the same was true at the end of the field test. At that time the teachers administered the test and therefore bias might have been present. The test at the first interview period was administered by a case analyst who had no relationship or vested interest in system or level of teacher preparation.

Table 53

Gray's Oral Mean Change Scores from Initial Testing Period to Interview Period 1 by Reading System and Teacher Level: New Jersey

	Basic Education System			
Teacher Level	I	II	III	IV
High school graduate	1.010	1.682	2.156	1.550
College graduate	1.484	0.800	2.118	2.470
Certified teacher	1.120	1.977	1.780	1.487

N=211

Table 54

Gray's Oral Mean Change Scores from Initial Testing Period to Interview Period 1 by Reading System and Teacher Level: New York

	Basic Education Systems			
Teacher Level	I	II	III	IV
High school graduate	0.596	1.070	0.960	0.765
College graduate	0.680	0.526	0.863	0.741
Certified teacher	1.069	0.989	0.968	0.708

N=348

Table 55

Gray's Oral Mean Change Scores from Initial Testing Period to Interview Period 1 by Reading System and Teacher Level: California

	Basic Education System			
Teacher Level	I	II	III	IV
High school graduate	0.988	1.166	1.053	0.507
College graduate	0.845	0.680	0.903	0.684
Certified teacher	1.557	0.714	0.716	1.230

N=321

Table 56

Average Gray's Oral Mean Change Scores from Initial Testing Period to Interview Period 1 by Reading System and Teacher Level: Three States Combined

		Basic Education System			
Teacher Level	Total	I	II	III	IV
Total	1.102	1.014	1.012	1.179	1.001
High school graduate	1.081	0.835	1.247	1.245	0.895
College graduate	1.228	0.946	0.644	1.140	1.135
Certified teacher	1.105	1.260	1.112	1.031	0.984

N=880

2. Mean Change Scores from the End of the Field Test to the First Interview Period

At the end of the field test, the grade level achieved by the participant Group of the study population from all three states was 4.665, and by states the grade levels achieved were:

... 5.133 in New Jersey
... 4.401 in New York
... 4.649 in California

The average reading gain scores for this group from the initial testing period to the end of the field test by state, were:

... 2.133 in New Jersey
... 1.482 in New York
... 1.794 in California

Thus, on the average, students gained between 1.5 and 2 grade levels in the three states. The test of significance denotes that there were significant differences in gains by state at the .01 level of confidence.

On the whole, the end of the field test was the point of highest achievement. There were individuals who continued to use their reading skills and continued to progress. In fact there were 127 individuals, representing some 15 percent of the participant group in the study, who were reading at the eighth-grade level or above at the time of the final interview. However, for the participants as a whole there was regression in reading skill between the end of the field test and the first and second interview periods. This would indicate that once the stimulus of the classroom experience was ended, reading ceased or was infrequent. This is probably due to lack of reading material, to the pressure of family responsibilities and to the fact that for many, reading had not become easy and therefore pleasurable. In fact, 343 of the participants were still reading at below the fifth-grade level at the second interview period.

The participant group's loss of reading skill in terms of grade level between the end of the field test and the first interview period by state was as follows:

... - 0.402 in New Jersey
... - 0.655 in New York
... - 0.913 in California

In examining mean change scores from the end of the field test to the first interview period by state, system and teacher level, the test of significance denotes that at the .01 and .05 levels there were no significant differences with regard to reading system or teacher level. However, there were significant differences by state at the .01 level of confidence.

The mean change scores by state, system, and teacher level can be seen in tables 57 to 59.

Table 57

Gray's Oral Mean Change Scores from End of Field Test to Interview Period 1 by Reading System and Teacher Level: New Jersey

Teacher Level	Basic Education System I	II	III	IV
High school graduate	-0.656	0.250	-0.238	-0.445
College graduate	-0.778	-1.666	-0.185	0.362
Certified teacher	-1.139	-0.466	-0.071	0.866

N = 189

Table 58

Gray's Oral Mean Change Scores from End of Field Test to Interview Period 1 by Reading System and Teacher Level: New York

Teacher Level	Basic Education System I	II	III	IV
High school graduate	-0.192	-0.160	-1.181	-0.421
College graduate	-0.322	-0.136	-0.427	-1.203
Certified teacher	-0.600	-0.516	-1.071	-1.570

N = 324

Table 59

Gray's Oral Mean Change Scores from End of Field Test to Interview Period 1 by Reading System and Teacher Level: California

Teacher Level	Basic Education System I	II	III	IV
High school graduate	-0.495	-1.236	-0.526	-1.491
College graduate	-0.335	-1.085	-0.773	-0.481
Certified teacher	-1.585	-0.773	-0.889	-1.009

N = 287

In New Jersey there were significant differences in the change scores from the end of the field test to the first interview period. However, these were not by level of teacher, but by system. There were three instances where positive gain rather than regression occurred. These are indicated as follows:

... students in classes taught by certified teachers using System IV showed a gain of 0.867 from the end of the field test to the first interview period in New Jersey

... students in classes taught by college graduates using System IV showed a gain of 0.363

... students taught by teachers with a high school education using System II showed a positive change of 0.250

The two latter instances might be accounted for by test error. For all three states combined, there was a decrease of -0.688 grade level from the end of the field test to the first interview period.

Table 60

Average Gray's Oral Mean Change Scores from End of Field Test to Interview Period 1 by Reading System and Teacher Level: Three States Combined

		Basic Education System			
Teacher Level	Total	I	II	III	IV
Total	-0.634	-0.686	-0.597	-0.653	-0.812
High school graduate	-0.570	-0.400	-0.419	-0.647	-0.784
College graduate	-0.547	-0.463	-0.787	-0.508	-0.592
Certified teacher	-0.870	-1.111	-0.439	-0.799	-1.107

N = 800

3. Mean Change Scores from the End of the Field Test to Second Interview Period

For all three states, there was a decrease in reading level from the testing period at the end of the field test classes to the time of the second interview period. The differential loss for the participant Group as a whole was -0.599

and by state the differential loss was:

... -0.329 in New Jersey
... -0.293 in New York
... -1.123 in California

There were no significant differences at the .01 or .05 levels of confidence by reading system or teacher level of preparation. The significant differences that did occur were by state at the .01 level of confidence and by a combination of reading system and teacher preparation at the .05 level of confidence. The difference was relatively small and can be accounted for by one group of classes in New Jersey taught by certified teachers using System IV. Individual scores were checked and it was found that three students out of eight in these classes made gains of one to two grade levels. Five of the eight had positive gain scores; two had losses and one remained unchanged.

The following table presents mean change scores from the end of the field test to the time of the second interview period by reading system and level of teacher preparation for all three states.

Table 61

Gray's Oral Mean Change Scores from End of Field Test to Interview Period 2 by Reading System and Teacher Level: New Jersey

	Basic Education System			
Teacher Level	I	II	III	IV
High school graduate	-0.535	0.509	-0.952	-0.370
College graduate	-0.407	-1.775	-0.566	0.378
Certified teacher	-0.316	-0.070	-0.600	1.500

N = 154

Table 62

Gray's Oral Mean Change Scores from End of Field Test to Interview Period 2 by Reading System and Teacher Level: New York

	Basic Education System			
Teacher Level	I	II	III	IV
High school graduate	-0.026	0.240	-0.565	0.103
College graduate	0.076	0.025	-0.180	-1.111
Certified teacher	-0.154	-0.104	-0.675	-1.155

N = 299

Table 63

Gray's Oral Mean Change Scores from End of Field Test to Interview Period 2 by Reading System and Teacher Level: California

	Basic Education System			
Teacher Level	I	II	III	IV
High school graduate	-0.910	-1.457	-0.669	-1.700
College graduate	-0.546	-1.116	-0.940	-0.773
Certified teacher	-1.880	-0.847	-1.306	-1.015

N = 255

Table 64

Average Mean Change Scores from End of Field Test to Interview Period 2 by Reading System and Teacher Level: Three States Combined

		Basic Education System			
Teacher Level	Total	I	II	III	IV
Total	-0.599	-0.611	-0.462	-0.759	-0.628
High school graduate	-0.522	-0.493	-0.273	-0.714	-0.635
College graduate	-0.559	-0.279	-0.749	-0.609	-0.255
Certified teacher	-0.868	-1.298	-0.359	-0.943	-0.798

N = 708

Analysis of data indicated that the differences by system and by teacher were too small to be significant.

Again, on the whole, participants showed regression after the end of the field test in all three states, in all four reading systems and by the three levels of teacher participation. However, in comparing scores from the first to second interviewing periods, some mean change scores which had been negative in the first interview period were positive in the second interview period. The range between negative and positive tended to be small, however.

4. Conclusions

Although roughly 15 percent of the participants attained a reading level which would permit them to participate in skill training requiring an eighth-grade reading level, the majority of participants did not retain the level of reading skill that they had at the end of the field test. This strongly suggests that unless positive action is taken to continue education or at least some group activity, a short exposure to education is not of long-run educational value. It is possible that it may have an adverse effect. It cannot be determined whether the frustration which accompanies failure to meet expected goals is a factor; however, it is likely that it would contribute to regression.

When it is considered that nonparticipants who were employed were able to read on the average as well as those who were in the field test, the impact of the stimulation of moving out into the world cannot be overlooked. In order to work, the majority would need to be able to read such practical items as labels,street signs and bus numbers. This probably makes it incumbent upon the employee to read at his optimum level.

In any case it is clear that no one level of teacher preparation or any given reading system was more effective in helping students retain reading skills.

VI. SOME EFFECTS OF PARTICIPATION IN THE FIELD TEST

Although the two separate chapters on findings deal in depth with the former field test participants, several areas related directly to the impacts and consequences of the field test and continuing relations with field test teachers and fellow students have not been discussed.

It is the intention in this chapter to explore these areas and report some of the nonquantifiable data, in order to express in fuller dimensions, the attitudes and feelings of this segment of the follow-up study population.

A. What Happened Regarding Further Education and Training

Because of the research nature of the field test, the welfare recipients who participated as students were not necessarily representative of the usual Title V program participants. Specifically absent from the selection criteria employed for the field test were those criteria related to employability, family size, and family problems.

Actually, the field test participants in all the communities and states were prescreened rather haphazardly, with few exceptions, before appearing at the screening session. In several communities a blanket letter was sent instructing all welfare recipients to appear for screening, regardless of age, educational level, or condition of health.

Selection for the field test was based on minimal criteria: a broad interpretation of performance on the Bender Visual Motor Gestalt Test used to identify gross dysfunctioning, a tentative, loosely interpreted IQ test (Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale), and a reading score below five on the Gray Oral Reading Test. Vision and hearing screening was also conducted, in some places, because of time pressure to get classes started, after the field test was already underway.

At the end of the field test there was a return to the strict interpretation of Title V regulations with regard to employability. In most of the field test communities, the Title V agency felt it had completed its obligations to the field test participants at the end of the field test. If the participants didn't meet standards for subsequent Title V programs, they were not considered for them.

It is understandable that Title V agencies were interested in moving welfare recipients into employment and off the welfare rolls; therefore there was a tendency to screen out all but those whom they felt would be successful. Consequently, the field test participants, who had attained, on an average, a 5th- or 6th-grade reading level, could not meet the criteria of the majority of Title V programs, at least an 8th-grade level. In addition, many of them had health and family problems which needed special service and attention before they could be considered employable. Still another adverse factor was the advanced age of quite a few participants.

For those participants who did continue in Title V programs following the field test, the area of greatest involvement was basic education, but even this avenue was restricted to selected communities. Participants were involved in other training programs to a very minimal extent.

Employment data on participants indicate that approximately 12 percent became employed full time and 6 percent part time, but it must be noted that the largest number of employed participants, 46 percent, reported that they made their way into employment via friends and relatives rather than through welfare or Title V services.

In contrast with this picture, what were the aspirations of the participants with respect to the field test? What perception did they have of the consequences of being involved in an educational experience?

During the first interview period, the responses to the question, "Was interviewee promised a job at the end of the field test?" revealed some interesting data. New Jersey participants indicated by 70 percent of the responses that it was their perception that they had been promised employment following the field test. This contrasts radically with only 7.5 percent in New York and 3 percent in California.

It would appear that the Title V agency in New Jersey had made employment commitments to the participants in line with their overall Title V plan which consisted of three distinct 17-week phases: 1) basic education, 2) basic education and/or skill training and/or employment, 3) basic education and/or skill training and/or employment. The other states had not developed comparable Title V follow-up plans for the field test participants, and this was reflected in the responses of their field test participants.

Following the field test, whether or not the Title V agency had promised employment, training programs and employment opportunities were evolved. The following table of responses from the first interview period illustrates these assignments.

Table 65

Assignments Interviewee Was Offered After the Field Test: Interview Period

Assignments Offered After Field Test	Total No.	Total Percent	New Jersey No.	New Jersey Percent	New York No.	New York Percent	California No.	California Percent
Total responses	954	100.0	232	100.0	386	100.0	336	100.0
Full-time job	19	2.0	17	7.0	-	-	2	1.0
Part-time job	2	-	-	-	-	-	2	1.0
Job training and education	38	4.0	11	5.0	23	6.0	4	1.0
Full-time education	173	18.0	17	7.0	151	39.0	5	1.0
Work experience	114	12.0	80	34.0	34	9.0	-	-
Job training	96	10.0	86	37.0	4	1.0	6	2.0
Part-time education	231	24.0	-	-	110	28.0	121	36.0
None	281	29.0	21	9.0	64	17.0	196	58.0

Total participant responses show the major offering as part-time education with 24 percent, but this is largely accounted for by New York and California, since New Jersey had no respondents in this category. New York's major offering was full-time education, 39 percent, while California's was part-time education, 36 percent. New Jersey's strongest offerings were in work experience, 34 percent, and job training, 37 percent. New Jersey had the largest and most diverse number of offerings, a total of 91 percent of the responses, while New York had 83 percent and California, 42 percent.

Another question dealt with whether the participants were given a choice of job training or job assignments. The responses on this were not significant, with the exception of New Jersey, because of the paucity of assignments made. In New York of the 39 who responded to this, 36 indicated they were not offered a choice; in California all 10 indicated they had no choice. New Jersey had a total of 186 responses: 59, or 32 percent, indicated they had been given a choice, and 127, or 68 percent, said that they had had no choice.

Despite the fact that so few felt they had been given a choice, it is interesting to note that 81 percent accepted their assignments.

When asked to view their assignments in terms of whether they represented a step toward economic independence, 27 percent responded favorably; 25 percent said "no," while 23 percent didn't know.

Data from the first interview period indicate that out of a total of 190 who accepted Title V training or work experience assignments (approximately 21 percent of the field test participant group of 919), 153, or 81 percent were in New Jersey. These training assignments in New Jersey varied according to community. In Camden County approximately 50 percent were in nursing homes and hospitals as nurses aide trainees, and about the same percentage were in department stores as sales and stock clerk trainees. Passaic County had a greater variety of training opportunities which included nurses aides, clerical, assembly line factory work, sewing machine operators, and restaurant food handlers.

It should be noted that employment resulting from Title V training or work experience opportunities was largely of a low, entry-level type. Camden reported that the average wage for full-time employment was approximately $202 per month; for the same period Passaic County indicated that its average was $257 per month.

The data on employment reveal several interesting aspects:

... The majority of those participants who became employed did so without Title V or welfare intervention.

... The majority who became employed were unable to leave public assistance completely and were receiving partial grants.

... The majority earned less than the poverty index of $3,200 per annum.

... The majority had held one job in the last 6 months.

... The majority indicated that they could have obtained their current job without the field test experience.

... The majority perceived their current job in a slightly more favorable light than their previously held jobs.

B. Child-Related Problems and Relations with Children

During the field test, one of the major problems affecting the ability of the participants to attend classes regularly was the need for the care of their preschool children. It must be remembered that almost 80 percent of the participants, were women with children. Financing was made available through the Title V agencies to pay for baby sitters. In most instances, the participants made their own child-care arrangements; in a smaller number of cases, the Title V casework counselors were able to recruit baby sitters or arrange day care supervision of children.

A substantial number, 316 or 34 percent of the field test participants used child-care arrangements. The majority of these, 184 or 58 percent brought their children to the baby sitter's home. A lesser number, 133 or 15 percent arranged to have the baby sitter in their own homes. Minimal use was made of day care centers, nursery schools, after-school care centers, and others (4 percent all together).

During the first interview period, it was learned that 80 percent of those who used child-care services found them to be satisfactory, although many of these reported that they had difficulty keeping their baby sitters and had to make frequent changes. Following the field test, since a portion of the participants were either involved in other programs or employed, some 70 or approximately 8 percent continued to use child-care arrangements.

Services of this kind were curtailed in at least two states following the field tests because of the cutback in Title V funds, and former participants found they could not continue in subsequent programs without the child-care stipend. Both New York and California reported both refusals to attend when child-care stipends were eliminated and a substantial drop in attendance. It should also be added that there was reluctance to take on low-level income employment because the added burden of paying for child care made it unfeasible. Several interviewers reported that participants had tried employment but found they were paying for the baby sitter, carfare, lunches, uniforms, etc., and were not showing any financial improvement.

Apropos of the above, with 101 field test participants reporting work-related expenses during the first interview period, 55 or 54 percent indicated expenses ranging from less than $5 to $6.99 per week. Even so, a good number, 29 or approximately 29 percent reported expenses from $15 to over $23 per week. Child-care expenses alone, for the 30 who found it necessary, amounted on an average to between $16 and $18+ per week.

Thus, it must be pointed out that major deterrents to program involvement and employment by welfare recipients are the expenses for child care and sundry employment expenses including lunches, carfare, uniforms, etc.

Field test participants shared with the entire follow-up study group a deep concern for their children. They often spoke of the pride their children took in the fact that they were attending classes to improve themselves. They also voiced their apprehensions with regard to their children's progress in school and the quality of education their children were receiving to equip them for economic survival. An effort was made to document the problems they were having with their children.

Out of the total of 919 participants in the field test, 699 reported that they had school-age children. Of these, 236 or 26 percent indicated they had been having serious problems with their children at the beginning of the field test; they also reported that there had been little or no change in the year and a half which had elapsed since the beginning of the field test. If any change at all was perceptible in the participants, it was in an increased awareness of the necessity for their children to stay in school and complete their education. Most of the problems they referred to centered around reading and learning problems in school and discipline problems at home and in school. The children were behind in reading and were not passing in their work. The parents voiced bitterness at the inability of the schools to "teach them to read properly." They decried the lack of interest in the educational system in mounting special efforts to compensate for their children's learning deficiencies. They expressed feelings of hopelessness in combatting discipline problems whether at home or in school.

More than 50 percent of them had been to their children's schools within the last year at the time of the second interview period. Aside from formal attendance at a PTA meeting, the major reasons for coming to school were teacher-student problems, academic or learning problems, and to talk to the teachers or the principal about their children.

Only 12 percent had been involved in school activities aside from regular PTA meetings; the majority of these were California participants. Only 12 percent were interested in becoming involved in PTA functions. When this area was explored further by field interviewers it developed that they didn't think they were particularly welcome, or they didn't have suitable clothing for the occasion. Those of the Spanish-speaking population were unwilling to become involved because of inadequate English language skills and the feeling that they didn't belong. In general, the majority were singularly uninformed about the role of the parent in relation to the school and did not know which activities they could become involved with, even if they were amenable to the prospect.

In their other relations with their children in respect to school-centered activities, there was no perceptible change from the beginning of the field test period through the first and second interview times, representing a period of one and a half years.

At the three intervals, the participant population reported:

... Over 70 percent made their children do their homework.

... Over 60 percent had conferences with teachers.

... Approximately 30 percent attended PTA meetings.

... Approximately 8 percent were involved with other forms of in-school activities.

The only evidence of change obtained was on the item indicating that the participant helped her children with their homework. At the beginning of the field test, 39 percent affirmed this. For the first and second follow-up interview periods, approximately 53 percent reported they were helping their children. It can be concluded that an increase in interest in their children's school work and an improvement in their ability to assist their children had resulted from their involvement in adult basic education classes. Participants have confirmed this almost universally.

Finally, no significant changes could be observed from the data with respect to participant-child socialization and other family-centered social, cultural, and entertainment activities over the two interview periods.

C. Continuing Relations with Former Teachers and Classmates

During the field test, socialization among participants was actively encouraged. Coffee breaks occurred at two intervals during the school day, and the lunch period was generally a class activity during which time the teacher and students discussed mutual problems, aired their grievances, and learned to appreciate each other. The rapport and understanding which resulted contributed much to the educative process, and many warm and close friendships evolved. Long after the field test was completed students continued to see each other; several classes formed clubs and conducted social activities.

It is not surprising, therefore, that a year after the end of the field test more than 38 percent of the participants had maintained some form of contact with their former teachers. These contacts were largely of a casual or informal type, although some participants continued their education with the same teacher.

Approximately 60 percent indicated that they would desire continued contact with their former teachers whom they found by an overwhelming majority (88 percent), to be warm and friendly persons who treated them equally and with dignity.

The relationships which had been formed among the participants during the field test appeared to flourish. More than a year after classes had been discontinued, 76 percent of the participants were still maintaining some form of contact. Fifty-nine percent said that casual contacts persisted, while 18 percent indicated that strong relations were being continued. A majority of 54 percent found this contact to be helpful and supportive.

The participants viewed their educational involvement as a successful experience, and with few exceptions felt they could recommend a similar experience to friends and relatives.

The major gains accomplished via the field test, as cited by a majority of the participants, were in the areas of learning to read and write and in the improvement of reading and math skills. Caseworkers and Title V casework counselors saw a decided increase in the participants' ability to communicate, a growth in confidence in themselves, and a remarkable improvement of self-image.

VII. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Findings

The following summary of findings is based on the data obtained from both interview periods of the follow-up study, including observations made by field analysts and supervisors.

Educational

1. There were no significant differences in retention of reading level for the participant Group by reading system or teacher level, or by a combination of reading system and teacher level for either interview period of the follow-up study.

2. There were significant differences in retention of reading level for the participant Group by state.

3. Group I, the participant Group, reached its apex of reading achievement level at the end of the 17 weeks of the field test, but there was a gradual loss from the end of the field test to the first interview period and from the first to the second interview period. The loss from the end of the field test to the second interview period was less than one grade level. Overall, for the participant Group, there was still a net gain of at least one grade level from the initial screening to the second interview period, approximately 18 months later.

4. Overall, the results in terms of grade level achievement resulting from educational involvement were disappointing; nevertheless, over 127 persons in Group I had been brought to eighth-grade reading level or beyond.

5. Group II, the nonparticipants, made approximately the same amount of gain in reading level as Group I for both interview periods, despite the fact that Group II had not been involved in the 17 weeks of classes.

6. It was found that those who made the greatest gains were those who had become employed, whether they had attended the field test classes or not. This was especially significant with respect to those in Group II who had become employed. In each case where the relationship between employment and reading achievement level was examined, the

reading achievement level was found to be significantly higher for those who were employed than for those who were not employed. It is evident that employment in itself is an important medium for improving reading ability.

7. Most of the persons in the study who were involved in programs following the field test came from Group I, and the largest number of them were continued in ABE programs. Group II was involved only to a small extent. Group III had the largest number of all Groups involved in GED classes. Some Group I individuals were also involved in GED classes, indicating that they had reached levels equal to those of Group III, which permitted them to enter these advanced classes.

8. Most of the participant Group did not become eligible for skill training programs because they had not reached adequate levels prescribed for skill training.

9. There was little difference in attendance pattern and dropout rate for those in the three Groups who were involved in programs following the field test.

10. Relatively few persons became employed after the field test. The totals for each interview period were under 200 and a large number of these were employed only part time. Only 85 were found to be employed at both interview periods. Group II had the greatest proportion employed at both interview periods, but a decrease in employment from interview period 1 to interview period 2 occurred. Group I increased its rate of employed persons from the first to the second interview period. This probably occurred because a number of persons in Group I were involved in educational and/or training programs and entered employment at the conclusion of the programs and by the time of the second interview period.

11. Group II had the largest relative percentage of persons who were no longer on public assistance at both interview periods.

12. The largest number of persons employed obtained their jobs through friends and relatives and personal canvassing. They did not rely on public employment agencies or the offices of Title V of the welfare department.

13. The average salaries for those who became employed full time at both interview periods were below the poverty index of $3,200 per year for a family of four and the majority of them were still receiving supplemental assistance from welfare.

14. The largest number of jobs obtained among all Groups were unskilled: factory worker, domestic, janitor, laborer and hospital aide. There were no differences with respect to type of job by Group, although Group III did have a slightly larger number of persons in clerical work.

Attitudes Toward Involvement in Programs

15. Most individuals involved in educational programs had positive attitudes toward the programs, and indicated that they felt they had made gains in reading and arithmetic skills. Negative reactions to the programs dealt largely with transportation difficulties, child care arrangements and the inadequacies or late payments of stipends.

16. The majority of those involved in training or work experience programs expressed negative feelings about the types of training they were exposed to, especially, with few exceptions, about the nurses aide type of training which they viewed as domestic work.

17. A large proportion of those not involved in programs following the field test expressed a desire to become participants. Of the three Groups, Group II had the largest relative number who were not desirous of involvement in any type of program.

18. The greatest proportion of those who did not want to become involved indicated that illness and being needed at home (child care problems) were the reasons for not wanting to become involved.

19. There were no significant differences with respect to those who became involved in educational and/or training programs and their grade-level achievement in reading.

20. There were no significant differences by Group with respect to increased participation in community organizations or increased awareness of community activities. Group II tended to participate less in community organizations and seemed to be less aware of community activities than were the other Groups. This varied from state to state and community to community. It was discernible that the study population, regardless of Group, was more aware of community activities and organizations in those areas which had active community action programs.

21. Over three-fourths of the study population did not attend PTA meetings at their children's schools, but over 70 percent visited their children's schools. The majority of those who visited the schools did so to participate in open school week or in regard to teacher-student problems.

22. There were no significant differences among the three Groups with respect to level of aspiration and level of expectation for their children's educational achievement. More than one-third aspired for their children to graduate from college but only one-quarter expected this to take place.

Agency Cooperation in Programs

23. Cooperation between education and welfare agencies varied considerably among the states and communities. There was little evidence of joint planning across agency lines at the state level. At the county level, with few exceptions, agency cooperation was minimal and was based on the necessity for joint funding. The goals of programs became blurred and each agency viewed the program from its own focus. Most of the problems which arose and interfered with cooperative planning and execution of programs resulted from crises within the individual agencies and from funding difficulties.

One notable exception was seen where exemplary cooperation occurred between education and welfare, both working together at the same school site.

Impacts of Programs and Employment on Welfare Grants

24. The costs for education and training were greater than the savings in welfare grants for those who became employed. This was based on a 12-month projection of employment and the data on reduced welfare grants for the same period.

25. It can be assumed that if these persons remain employed for a longer period of time and are joined in employment by those still in training, the savings will eventually outstrip the costs of education and training.

26. Because most of the study population have home responsibilities which interfere with employment, it is difficult to assess either the number who will move into employment or the duration of their stay in the labor market.

B. Recommendations

1. Because short, terminal education experiences for this population have proven to be wasteful and inefficient in producing meaningful positive change, whether in reading achievement level or employability status, it is recommended that no short-term education programs

be undertaken unless they are followed through with training and employment or some other kind of planned involvement.

2. It is evident that the current state of knowledge about how to teach functional illiterates and produce rapid improvement in their reading ability in relatively short periods of time is singularly deficient. Therefore, effort should be placed on experimentation to develop new techniques and materials to alter this situation.

Since no short cuts to improving the reading levels of this population exist at present, it should be recognized that long-term programs with all the concommitant follow-up services, funded for periods of at least two years, are necessary.

3. If the purpose of programs for this disadvantaged, adult, dependent population is to move them into manpower training programs and eventual employment regardless of their sex or the size of their families, an important factor must be considered. Large numbers of women with sizeable families account for a considerable portion of the welfare population. It has been found that the absence of adequate child care facilities is the greatest deterrent to involving these women in programs. Experimentation should be encouraged to provide good child care facilities at the sites where education and training are held. This should not only permit the mothers to maintain contact with their children, but should also prove beneficial to the children in providing nursery or preschool experiences for them. Consideration should also be given to experimenting with joint Head Start and Teacher-Aide training programs for women with children.

4. It was found that this population is generally unaware of the existence of services and programs in the community. Further, these persons do not enroll in programs even if they are aware of their existence. It is therefore recommended that they be actively recruited and helped to attend by providing necessary supportive services, including counseling and work orientation. In addition, experimentation should be encouraged to discover the optimum methods of recruiting and holding them in programs.

5. In view of a finding of this follow-up study, that employment in and of itself was a most effective medium in raising the reading level of the study population, it is recommended that in developing programs for the disadvantaged, priority be given to creating meaningful employment for them.

6. It is further recommended that extended research be undertaken into programs which have an employment base combined with an educational plan. The purpose of this would be to measure the relative impact on raising literacy levels among the disadvantaged population and to isolate the educational elements in employment which produce such impact.

7. It was discovered that the largest number who became employed found their jobs through relatives and friends. They made minimal use of public employment agencies because of unsuccessful experiences with them in the past. It is recommended that the state employment security agencies, in line with their significantly new role under the 1967 amendments to the Social Security Act, make determined efforts to recruit, counsel and find employment for the welfare recipient.

8. It is strongly recommended that efforts be augmented to develop meaningful cooperation on all levels among agencies which provide services for the dependent population. This cooperation should result in the establishment of program linkages, providing continuous experiences from basic literacy to employment. Efforts similar to CAMPS or CEP should be extended to accomplish total organization of agency resources to service the disadvantaged.

ERIC Clearinghouse
OCT 25 1968
on Adult Education